

17  
*The Church and State Vindicated;*

AND THE

*Theology*  
*Band 2.*

Bishop of Bangor's

PRESERVATIVE

DEFENDED,

Against Several late ANSWERS to it.

---

In a LETTER to the Right Reverend  
the Lord Bishop of ELY.

---

Ἱερωσύνη καὶ βασιλεία εἰς ἑν ὁρῶσι τέλει, τὴν τῇ Ἱππικῶν  
σωτηρίαν. Isidor, Pelusiot.

---

By the Author of *The Divine Rights of the  
British Nation.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. DARBY for R. BURLIGH in Amen-  
Corner, J. HARRISON at the Royal Exchange, and  
A. DODD without Temple-Bar. M. DCC. XVII.

(Price One Shilling.)

*Hopton Haycock Esq.*

The Church and State N indicated;

AND THE

Bishop of Bangor's

PRESERVATIVE

DEFENDED.

Against several late Answers to it.

In a LETTER to the Right Reverend  
the Lord Bishop of Ely.



Printed by J. DAVY at the Royal Exchange, and  
A. DODD without Temple-Bar. M.DCC. XVII.

By the Author of The Divine Rights of the  
British Nation.

L O N D O N.

Printed by J. DAVY for M. BURNARD in Ainslie-  
Court, J. HARRISON at the Royal Exchange, and  
A. DODD without Temple-Bar. M.DCC. XVII.

(Price One Shilling.)



# The Bishop of BANGOR'S Pre- servative Defended, &c.

MY LORD,

**W**HEN some of the *Bishops*, and a small number of our *Clergy*, refus'd the Oaths that were appointed *Anno 1689*, I have very good Reason to believe, not one of 'em had it in his Thoughts, at first, to form a *Separation* from our Church. The *Questions* upon which there was a Disagreement at that time, were chiefly of a *Civil Nature*; about which there began to be different Opinions in the Reign of King *James the First*: yet these were not judg'd to be of that consequence to the Church, as to make it necessary for a Convocation to declare its Judgment thereupon.

**S. 2.** I take it for granted (because I am sure the contrary does not appear from any Authentick Act or Decision made or done in any Convocation held from the beginning of the *Reformation*) that our Church has never yet in her *Supreme Judicature*, after

a special Deliberation, given us her final and explicit Declaration of her Sense upon all the Questions that were first debated between Us and the *Nonjurors*, in favour of the said *Nonjurors*, and against us, who maintain the Justice of the present Settlement. But on the contrary, this we are sure of, from Archbishop *Sanderfort's* Copy of *Canons*, publish'd 1689, that the Sense of the *Convocation*, which made those *Canons* about 1606, was entirely on our side, and fully against the *Nonjurors* in several Particulars.

§. 3. 'Tis very well known, my Lord, that our Bishops in Parliament have frequently concurr'd with the State in many such Votes and publick Acts, as plainly shew'd their Sentiments were different from the Opinions of those Gentlemen who have of late Years refus'd the Oaths: Of this their Men of Reading cannot be ignorant. And certainly it ought to be well consider'd by 'em, that though there has been no Judicial Determination in form by our whole Church-Representative, upon the several Questions in dispute between Us and the *Nonjurors*; yet our Bishops, and our ablest Writers, have often declar'd their Sense before the *Revolution* happen'd: and which is more than that, before the unhappy Troubles in the Reign of King *Charles the First*, at which time they could be under no Bias or Impressions from their own or the publick Circumstances; and by consequence, their Judgments must have been the more impartial. Men of Probity and Modesty can never persuade themselves, that what was done and agreed, nay and zealously espous'd by our Bishops in Parliament in the Case of the Queen of *Scots*, and of the Assistance of her Subjects and the *Dutch*, against their oppressive Princes; can possibly be suppos'd to favour the modern Opinions of our *Nonjurors*. Nor do the *Nonjurors* pretend to approve of the Assistance that was given, or pretended to be given, to the *Rochellers* by King *Charles the First*; or to like the Forms of Prayer then us'd in our Churches in be-

half



half of our *Protestant Brethren in France*. No, these Authorities are fully on our side, and as fully against the *Nonjurors*; of which they are sufficiently sensible, and make us so too, by the weak and evasive Defences they have publish'd against them.

§. 4. As our *Convocations*, which are our *supreme Ecclesiastical Assemblies*, have not actually decided our several controverted Questions about *Civil Power and Obedience*; so 'tis not very probable they will do it: because, though Obedience in general to Superiors of all kinds, is a Christian Doctrine; yet the particular Instances of Civil Power and Obedience are Matters purely of a Civil Nature and Cognizance, and are only and finally determinable by our *Laws*, and in our *Legislative Assemblies*, in Parliament; and by no means in a *Convocation*, who act not there as Legislators, by a supreme and underiv'd Authority.

§. 5. However, my Lord, we have on our side the highest Ecclesiastical Authorities that are extant; I mean, that of our Bishops acting in their Legislative Capacity: and we have also on our side the Supreme Civil Authority, in some Instances or other, in every Reign since the Reformation, as I shall fully evince upon some other Occasion. But, which is above all these Authorities, we have also on our side the highest Authority, I mean the Word of God; and the general Sense of all Civiliz'd Nations: To which our Adversaries, the *Nonjurors*, oppose some ill-chosen Passages out of the *Homilies*, and the Writings of *Private Divines*; and they are so unreasonable, as to stile such defective Authorities the Doctrine of the Church, and demand we should receive 'em as such. And as to their Comments upon the Thirteenth of the *Romans*, and some other Texts in the Old and New Testament, they are so injudicious, not to say absurd and stupid, that I have often blush'd to see some Men, who in other Matters are not destitute of Prudence and Understanding, openly espousing and forming



forming a Party against Church and State, upon so weak a Foundation.

§. 6. The Leaders soon grew sensible, that their Cause would sink, and their Faction expire, if they built their Hopes upon the Strength of their *Civil Notions*; and this put 'em upon looking out for *Successors*. Accordingly they began in their Pamphlets to attack the *Royal Supremacy*; they maintain'd soon after the *Independency of the Church on the State*; they advanc'd new *Notions of Sacerdotal Power*; the *Necessity of a regular and uninterrupted Succession*; the *Invalidity of the Sacraments*, and of all *Divine Offices administered by our Protestant Brethren at home and abroad*; the *Efficacy of Sacerdotal Absolution*; the *Usefulness of Prayers for the Dead*: and one of their number has been so hardy as to defend the *Natural Mortality of Human Souls*. But to compleat their Design, they have at last agreed upon a Scheme of Civil and Religious *Notions*, which strike at the Root of our Reformation; insomuch that they have publicly declar'd their Hopes of an Union with the Popish Church of *France*, and at the same time assert our Church to be *Schismatical*, and our Prayers and Ministrations to be *Wicked and Immoral*.

§. 7. In this Disposition are our Jacobite Separatists, though their Leaders, A Bishop *Sancroft*, Bishop *Kenn*, and Dr. *Hickes*, were all within a few hours of taking the Oaths to King *William*. The two first perhaps, who died some years since, little thought of the Schemes that Dr. *Hickes* and his Adherents form'd afterwards; and had they liv'd, 'tis reasonable to think, would have disapprov'd 'em. By the Death of the rest, Dr. *Hickes* was left at the Head of the *Schism*, and being a Man of Spirit and Animosity, resolv'd to be considerable: with the Assistance of some Under-Writers, he has leven'd the Nation with some Principles inconsistent with our Constitution in Church and State; when at the same time those Writers pretend an extraordinary Zeal for both,

both, and by that impose upon the Unwary. But now they have thrown off the Mask; they declare our Establish'd Church Schismatical, and affirm the Jacobite Party to be the only True Church of England.

§. 8. This Party, though inconsiderable in it self for Numbers or Interest, yet are confident and turbulent; chiefly because they have receiv'd too much Countenance from some, who have taken the Oaths to the present Government; whom, in requital for that Kindness, the Nonjurors look upon as Apostates.

§. 9. 'Tis no wonder to see a Fluctuation in Mens Principles, when too many set out at first without any good Foundation; and so few give Attention enough to examine the Grounds of the Christian Religion, and of our *English* Reformation and Constitution. Others are under an unhappy Bias from Resentment or Disappointment; and the Opinions of most are not owing to Meditation, but Party.

Warm with Prejudice and Party-Zeal, some have fallen upon the Bishop of *Bangor's Preservative*; 'tis not strange he should offend the *Nonjurors*, for their Cause is desperate: methinks therefore abler Pens should have been employ'd. But 'tis surprizing to find two Persons of our own Communion attack the Bishop with so little Ceremony. Some years since a Man would for this have been call'd a thousand *Presbyterians*; now the Tide is turn'd, to defend our Bishops is a sure Mark of a *Presbyterian*: if Men indulge this peevish Humour, they will gratify the Papists, and call our Liturgy and Homilies *Presbyterian* at last. The common Enemy boast in their Correspondence abroad, of the Giddiness of our People, and make use of the present ill Temper of the Nation to gain Proselytes; Numbers are become Favourers of Popery, and are ready upon a slight Attack or Invitation to quit our Communion, for a Church that makes the greatest noise about *Sacerdotal*

*Powers,*

*Powers, and a regular uninterrupted Succession, &c.* This Tendency to Popery, with Riots and Rebel-  
lions, and a settled Disaffection to our true Consti-  
tution in Church and State, are the unhappy Fruits  
of Jacobitism.

§. 10. In conjunction with the Nonjurors, many  
who have not yet deserted our Communion, for-  
getting their Duty and Relation to our Church and  
Government, are constantly employ'd in assaulting  
both; and if any Paper or Writer be considerable  
for Zeal in defending the Church and State, some of  
our false Brethren and pretended Churchmen immedi-  
ately raise all the Clamours and Calumnies they can  
invent, and are as busy to serve the *Jacobite Cause*, as  
if they had renounc'd our Communion, and declar'd  
for the *Protender* and his Faction. With these Aux-  
iliaries, and a Spirit of Fury and Defamation, the  
Nonjurors, from a small and accidental Original,  
are grown up to a *Party, daring many bold things, and  
designing more.*

§. 11. The Bishop of *Bangor* has for many Years  
been their Hatred, as now he is their Envy: But if  
Candour and Modesty had any Influence upon these  
Men, they must have applauded the *Preservative*; for  
it fairly represents our Strength, and the Weakness  
of the Cause of the Nonjurors: tho' the last is suffi-  
ciently done by themselves, especially in the An-  
swers they have publish'd against the *Preservative*.

The first Paper against the *Preservative*\*, which is  
the most specious of the four I shall examine, tells  
his Reader, pag. 10. that "Possession (he means of  
the Throne) "is a thing purely accidental, but what are  
"properly call'd Principles are fix'd, and Right unalte-  
"rable." This is certainly true, if rightly taken.  
The Right of Nations to intrust themselves, and  
their Affairs, with such Persons and Families as they

---

\*Layman's Considerations on the Bp of Bangor's *Preservative*.  
shall



## Preservative Defended, &c. 19

shall be reasonable, is an unalterable Right; that is, Nations can't, *de Jure*, be divested of it by their Trustees, tho, in Fact, it too often happens to be otherwise. This Right has often been exercis'd by our Nation, and by all our Neighbour Nations, as fully appears in History. The Case of the *Stuarts* is a famous Instance of it: The Possession of the Throne of Scotland by them was purely accidental, as the *Layman's* Words are; it was not fix'd by any Divine Law, nor by any Human Law, that gave the *Stuarts* an unalterable Right, but by an Act of the States or Parliament of Scotland. And is there any human positive Law, or Act of Parliament, in its own nature unalterable? Surely the *Layman* is a Gentleman of too much Sense, and, I hope, of too much Candour, to affirm there is.

§. 12. The Preservative, he says, is built upon two Articles, that the King may deprive Bishops, and the People depose Kings; or alienate their Right by Acts of their own, which they may have the Liberty to call Acts of Parliament." Sir, saving the Impropriety of your Terms, what is there new or absurd in this? In our, and all other Christian Kingdoms, Princes have claim'd and exercis'd a Right of depriving Bishops of their Temporalities, and of the Exercise of their Function too, within not only those Bishops Dioceses, but their Prince's Dominions, by Imprisonment, Banishment, or express Prohibitions. And our and all civiliz'd Nations have asserted and exercis'd their Right, as they saw occasion, to depose or set aside (not Kings, Sir, for they who are truly and properly such, are not *de Jure* opposable or deposable) but Tyrants, that is, Enemies to their Country, and to Mankind. I need not put this Gentleman in mind of the Honours that were done, by erecting Statues to the Memory of *Harmodius* and *Aristogiton*, the Deliverers of their Country from *Hipparchus*. However he may judge by that of the

B

Sense

10 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

Sense of the *Greeks* \*: But Examples would be infinite. The Roman Senate gave Sentence in such Cases, *Sueton. in Neron. cap. 49.* And the Emperor *Wenceslaus* (the German *Sardanapalus*) was depos'd, *Communi Suffragio abrogatum Wenceslao Imperium: Schonborn, de Potestate Electorum, in Electione & Degradatione Imperatorum.* I refer this Layman for Instances of this kind to the Histories of *Sweden, Denmark, France, Spain,* and other *European Monarchies.* By which publick Acts he will find not only the publick Peace and Liberties have been preserv'd, but those very *Monarchies* have been establish'd upon a more lasting Foundation. When National Assemblies have before them an Affair of this nature, they can't be properly said to *alienate a Right*, for that was before either forfeited or abdicated; but rather to assert their *own Rights*, and to settle their *own Affairs*, which every private Man may do: And such National Assemblies will always take a liberty to stile their own Acts by what Names they think fit, how improper soever it may appear to this Gentleman: Who has not consider'd that Nations have lasted after the Extinction of several Regal Families; and whenever that has happen'd, the Supreme Power was solely in the *Estates* or National Assemblies: who acting in the highest Capacity, and with an Absolute and Sovereign Power, may therefore give what Stile or Denomination they please to their own Acts; by which Acts they create new Regal Families, or new Forms of Government, and dispose of themselves and their Affairs by an Independent and Unlimited Authority.

But the Power and Authority of Regal Families, set up by National Assemblies, must be limited in the nature of the thing, because 'tis morally impossible to conceive an Assembly of reasonable Men

---

\* Cicero pro Milone.

should derive a Power from themselves against themselves : Such Acts are null, even in private Cases, by our and the Roman Law. To plead therefore for absolute Submission, or Obedience to limited Power, is absurd : And to suppose such Obedience to be an Apostolical Principle, as the *Author of the Layman's brief Observations*, &c. pag. 10. seems to do, is more absurd. And as for his two ancient Apostolical Principles of Obedience to the Civil Magistrate, and the Rights of the Holy Catholick Church, they will not be disputed when rightly stated. 'Tis the absurd and stupid Sense of those Doctrines propos'd by the Non-jurors, that only is rejected, and ought to be rejected. My Lord, let them be *Anathema*, whoever they be, who are for giving a Sanction to Tyranny or Anarchy. Let the Rights of Princes be sacred, and let the Rights of Nations be as sacred : But let not unskilful angry Men take upon them to call that the Prince's Right, or the People's Duty, which is nothing less : Let them not presume to stile Absurdities Apostolick Doctrines, and Doctrines of our Church, and then call in the French or the Suedes to persuade us to believe them.

§. 13. We know the Church and State to be distinct things, p. 12. and that Obedience is due to the Laws of each. But then that Obedience is a reasonable Act, and is to be govern'd by the Laws of each Society, and not by the arbitrary Dictates of Princes, either Secular or Spiritual. The Christian Laws of highest Authority are contain'd in the *Christian Code*, the New Testament ; we are bound to the strictest Observance of them. But for " true Faith and Allegiance to the Authority lodg'd in Ecclesiastical Bodies, by Succession from the Apostles," pag. 12. as the Terms are new, so the Notion is false, and has misled a great part of *Christendom* into an open Resistance of the Supreme Power and Authority of the sacred *Canons* of the Holy Scriptures. Mankind are so prone to become the Servants of Men, and Ecclesiastical Bodies



have been so apt to dispense with the Service of God, that they have no good reason to expect *"we should look upon their Decisions in Spiritual Affairs, as obligatory as the Laws of a Civil Power are upon Ecclesiasticks in Civil Affairs,"* as this Lay-Gentleman would have it. Reasonable Men ought to stand oblig'd to their own Acts and Deeds, and to the certain Laws of God; but to be oblig'd by the Acts of Persons, who are not our Delegates or Representatives, who act not, and pretend not to act by our Appointment or Consent, but without it and against it, is not reasonable without Deliberation.

§. 14. This Lay-Gentleman acquaints us, pag. 13. *"Tis for want of considering the Distinction of Civil and Ecclesiastical Authority, that a Difference in Religion has been imagin'd to excuse our Allegiance, and make an Alteration in Civil Right: whereas, says he, in reality they are two very different Questions; Whether a Prince, tho a Papist, has a Right to reign over us? And whether, as a Prince, he has a Right to impose his own Religion upon us? The last, if not deny'd, he says, will bring us back to our former Confusion, (I suppose he means to Popery;) but if the first be not answer'd in the Affirmative, it will, he says, make Right very precarious, and our Kingdom little better than Elective."* The second Question he answers right, but as to the first Question, he only says there will follow two Inconveniences, if that Question be not answer'd affirmatively; that is, if we won't affirm, *That a Prince, tho a Papist, has a Right to reign over us, then his Right will be very precarious, and the Kingdom little better than Elective.* I answer; If Mankind were generally wise and good, an elective Succession would be the best; but in the present State of Things, the Hereditary is certainly better, to avoid Parties and Conflicts at every Demise. But then no Hereditary Succession can be establish'd, or was indeed ever establish'd with an *absolute Non-obstante* to all future Incapacities or Male-administration

tion whatever. This very Gentleman, pag. 15. says, *Lunacy, or Natural Incapacity are virtually excepted in States, as well as private Families, being of a Civil Nature.* The Right of Succession arises from the first Settlement, or from a constant tacit Consent to the Succession of the next Lineal Heir; but this Settlement and this Consent are reasonable Acts of reasonable Creatures, who never intended to resign themselves and their Heirs to an Enemy, or an *Apolylon* of the State: yet this stupid Hypothesis must be the Foundation of all our Contests with the *Nonjurors*, or another Notion that is worse, *viz.* That God, tho an infinitely wise and good Being, has deliver'd up great *Cantons* of Mankind to certain Regal Families, and their Heirs after them, with a Title Indefeasible and Unchangeable either by those Princes or the People; tho the greatest and most general publick Good might accrue from such a Change: which is a Principle so highly reflecting on both the Wisdom and Goodness of Almighty God, and so confident an Assertion, without ground upon, and indeed with very little countenance from the Holy Scriptures, that 'tis strange any Person of attentive Reflection should maintain so monstrous and so absurd an Hypothesis.

§. 15. The *Nonjurors*, as was hinted before, are forc'd to allow, " That a \* *Lunatick or Idiot may be coerced,*  
 " put under the Restraint of a Regency, which is an ef-  
 " fectual Exclusion from Government; and this because  
 " he is wholly incapable of answering the Ends of Go-  
 " vernment. This is so plain, that all, even the most  
 " unwilling, acknowledg it in the Case of Idiocy or Mad-  
 " ness. The End of Government is acknowledg'd the  
 " sufficient only Reason for setting aside *Lunaticks* or  
 " *Idiors*, and therefore the same End of Government  
 " holds equally in all parallel Cases. — If a Prince has

\* *Bishop's Preservative*, pag. 21, 22.

14      *The Bishop of BANGOR*

“ any Principles in him that oblige him to destroy us;  
 “ (and our Constitution) he is incapable to preserve us,  
 “ and make us happy: But a Prince, fully possess’d by  
 “ the Popish Religion, is under the Command of Principles,  
 “ which teach him that ’tis his Duty to destroy us;  
 “ and therefore he must have the greatest of all Incapacities.” The Bishop adds, “ Because an Idiot or  
 “ Lunatick may be restrain’d, but a Bigot may not.” I add also, that a Popish Prince of Cunning and Courage has the greatest Opportunity of ruining his Protestant Subjects, and subverting the Laws and Constitution. Idiots and Lunatics cannot govern themselves, much less a Kingdom; but then they have not Sense to destroy it: whereas a crafty Prince, whose Notions are inconsistent with the Government he is to exercise, cannot, in virtue of those Principles, but change or destroy the Government. The Mischief in these two Cases differs just as much, as the Enmity of a Fool or a Madman differs from the Enmity of a crafty politick Enemy. If Idiocy or Lunacy then be an Incapacity allow’d in all Times, and in all Nations, Popish Bigotry is a far greater Incapacity in our and all Protestant Nations. The Lay-Gentleman, who remarks upon the Bishop of Bangor \* (as was said before) admits “ Lunacy, or  
 “ Natural Incapacity to be of a Civil Nature, and virtually excepted in States as well as private Families;  
 “ but Moral Incapacity, he says, is of another nature,  
 “ and never interrupts the Succession in a Family, without the concurrent Will of the Testator, &c.” Which is a great Mistake; for Treason and Felony are Moral Incapacities, which interrupt and extinguish Succession in private Families; and so does Popery here, as well as Protestantism in France. And Popery is such a Moral Incapacity, as obliges its Votaries to use all their power to destroy Hereticks by Fire and Sword,

---

\* Layman’s Considerations on the Bishop of Bangor’s Arguments, pag. 15.



to overturn Protestant States and Governments, to violate Oaths, Treaties, and the most sacred Obligations; so that 'tis not possible for a Man, in a moral Sense, to be more incapable of any Trust, than a Popish Prince is of a Protestant Government. The Lay-Gentleman thinks the Bishop concludes too much from the Incapacity of one Popish Prince to the Exclusion of all his Popish Heirs; but if Popery be it self an absolute Incapacity, that being equally in all Popish Heirs, ought equally to exclude them all, as incapable of exercising a Protestant Government.

§. 16. The Lay-Gentleman argues to this effect, pag. 15. that "If a Heathen Prince must be submitted to, by Rom. 13. then a Papist, who is less dangerous, may be submitted to." Submission was due to a Heathen Emperor, and is due to a Popish Prince, unless he and his Heirs are excluded by the Constitution. Christians in early Ages submitted to the Civil Laws, and Governors in being; the Constitution was against them, but is for us. A Pagan Prince govern'd a Pagan State by Pagan Laws: We are a Protestant Nation, and have a Protestant Constitution, to which our Princes owe Submission, so as to make it the Rule of their Government, which a Popish Prince can't do; and if he can't rule us by our Laws, he can't rule us at all, for we can be govern'd no other ways. The Primitive Christians had no Laws to defend them from *Paganism*, we have Laws to defend us against *Popery*; which they can't do, if they are not executed, and that will never be by a Popish Prince. The Primitive Christians as Men must be subject in Temporals to some Civil Government; they had no Christian Civil Government for the first three Centuries, and therefore they submitted to the Pagan Civil Powers in all Countries where they dwelt; as our Travellers do, except in religious Matters alone. Had the Laws of the *Roman* State excluded a Pagan or Tyrannical Emperor, *St. Paul* had been the last Man in the whole *Roman* Empire, who

## 16 The Bishop of BANGOR

who would have pleaded for Obedience to him, or for his Restoration. The Peace of Nations, and the Rights of Mankind, were of greater account, and of higher value in the Judgment of the inspir'd Writers, than the imaginary and most unreasonable Claim of any Tyrannical Prince, who had a Right to nothing but the Vengeance of the *Senate*.

When St. Paul taught Submission to the Powers, *in being*, 'twas to the Just and Righteous Laws of the Empire, which were in Civil Matters the only proper Rule of Obedience, and not the Will and Pleasure of a Wicked and Tyrannical *Nero*; whom for the Good of the whole Empire, had the Christians then been a Majority, they would have certainly depos'd, because *Nero* resisted the Ordinance of God (*viz.* a Good and Just Government) more than any one Man in the whole Empire.

§. 17. Well, but this Lay-Gentleman tells us, p. 15. that "when St. Paul taught Submission to the Powers, *in being*, the Christians at Rome labour'd under the Yoke of Tyranny and Persecution; and the then Emperor was a Man of most vicious Morals. Now I hope no one will say, that Popery is more dangerous than Paganism; or which is the same, that a Heathen who endeavour'd to propagate Idolatry, and persecuted all that believed in Christ, was to be submitted to as their Civil Government; and yet a Papish Prince to be voted incapable of Ruling us, as a Civil Establishment, merely because he is not a Protestant?"

Answer. 1. St. Paul taught Submission to just Power as a Duty, and to unjust irresistible Violence, as prudent.

2. Popery is really more dangerous than some sorts of Paganism to the Rights and Liberties of Mankind; a Fact which no one, who reads Foreign History, can be ignorant of.

3. A few Christians, without any Publick Establishment, were to submit to a Heathen; when a Majority of Christians, whose Religion is established,

are

are not bound to submit to a Heathen, or a Papist endeavouring to subvert it: for their Establishment is a part, and the best part of the *Powers* that be, or of the *Ordinance of God*, &c. to which they are to submit.

4. A Popish Prince cannot rule us by Protestant Laws, as abundance of our Statutes are; and they are such Laws too, as I hope we chiefly value: and therefore voting such a Prince incapable of ruling us, is our declaring what he knew in his own Conscience was true.

§. 18. But the Lay-Gentleman hopes no one will say, *That Popery is more dangerous than Paganism*. I answer certainly 'tis, in some respects, than some sorts of Paganism, under which Christians may live peaceably and safely: but under Popish Governments there is no Medium betwixt Popery and Persecution. He goes on; "*A Heathen propagating Idolatry, and persecuting Christians, was to be submitted to as their Civil Governour*." If he means by St. Paul's Doctrine such Submission was due, it must be understood in all things just, reasonable, and prudent. To be quiet was their Province, who had it not in their power to remedy the Disorders of the Roman Government; which great good Work, if others neglected, to whom it belong'd, and quietly suffer'd good Government, the Ordinance of God, to be trampled on, they were inexcusable.

§. 19. But the Lay-Gentleman says, p. 16. "*Suppose it be allow'd, that a Popish Prince has once endeavour'd the Subversion of the Civil Constitution, will it therefore follow that every Roman Catholick Prince will certainly do the same?*" Who is this Gentleman? What has he to do to put such an absurd Question, when all is settled? If this Gentleman be a Papist, he does not doubt but a Popish King would subvert our Protestant Constitution: And if he be a Protestant, he can't doubt it, unless he wants common Sense. For a Papist, as such, professes himself an Enemy to our Constitution, and can be no



less, whilst he continues a *Papist*; and to fancy he would not, as the *Layman* speaks, is great Weakness, or dissembling his real Opinion: for did he ever know any *Popish Prince*, in any *Protestant Country*, that fail'd in his Duty to the *Papal Interest*, when 'twas in his power? But we are at present otherwise engag'd, God be prais'd, and shall not make a trial of the Unanimity of the Church in asserting her Rights, which we should have little reason to expect from abundance of her Members; who are little acquainted with her Constitution, and would, too many of 'em, value a Prince's Favour above any Religion in the World.

§. 20. This Gentleman in his 16th Page is pleas'd to acquaint us with his Notion of the word *Abdication*, which he says the *Romans* understood to be, "when a *Magistrate* or *Officer* voluntarily resign'd his Trust, and lived a private Member of the same Community; which is best understood by reading *Roman Writers*. Now (says he) this was so far from being the Case of the late King James, that he fled for his Personal Security, and continu'd claiming till his Death." I know this has pass'd current among many, and some who should know better, for many years, as the true and only Notion of the word *Abdication*. But had this *Lay Gentleman*, or his Friend, well consider'd the *Roman Writers*, he would have found often in those Writers a *Compulsive* as well as a *Voluntary Abdication*; in *Livy* particularly: *Coegerunt abdicare se Magistratu*, will be found in that *Historian* again and again: And the *Civilians* in their Books are no Strangers to that Phrase. So that I wonder this *Layman* should mention *Roman Historians*, and be at the same time a Stranger to the Sense of the word *Abdication*. The late King James's Abdication was in both senses; all the parts of his Male-Administration, recited in the *Bill of Rights* \*, particularly his raising the

\* 1<sup>st</sup> Will. & Mary.

*Customs without Law, and his assuming a Dispensing Power above the Law, were in the nature of the thing a Voluntary Abdication of the Limited Government he had sworn to: and his Flight was, at least in his own Thoughts, a Compulsive Abdication, and indeed was the just Consequence of his Voluntary Abdication. And it was also the greatest Blessing, at that time, that could have happen'd to our Church and Nation, except his Death, which follow'd in God's time, after he had been mortify'd with the greatest Disappointments, and fill'd up the Measure of his Sins; particularly that Sin of the greatest Size, and deepest Dye, viz. his endeavouring to overthrow our Constitution, which he was sworn to maintain.*

S. 21. In vain does this Gentleman, p. 17. amuse himself and his Readers with a Distinction between Civil and Ecclesiastical Power, which the Bishop did by no means forget, but expressly mentions again and again. And whereas the Gentleman is pleased to inculcate the Notion of a *Spiritual Relation between the Bishop and his Diocese, and affirms it to be indissoluble by Civil Power*; he is desir'd to consider,

1. That the Parliaments and Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's \* Reign had no such Notion. The Parliament not only depriv'd all Ecclesiastical Persons, and made void their Preferments, who refus'd the Oath of Supremacy, but disabled such from retaining or exercising any Office or Promotion during Life. And the Act of Uniformity 1562, by several Clauses, made Bishops and all other Ecclesiasticks deprivable by that Statute; and the Vacancies were fill'd in both Reigns without the least Thought of the indissoluble Relation of the Deprived.

Ans. 2. This Indissoluble Relation is no Scripture Notion, was not taught by our first Reformers, nor by the Primitive Fathers; but is a late Opinion

---

\* 1<sup>st</sup> Eliz. c. 1.

founded on Dr. Hicks's Scheme of a *Spiritual Monarchy*. The *New Testament* acquaints us with the mutual Duties of Pastor and People; but no where insists upon such a spiritual Relation, &c. as is not to be dissolv'd by the Civil Power. And the first Christian Emperors frequently dissolv'd that Relation, as appears by divers Facts related by *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*.

*Answ. 3.* 'Tis observable that the same Persons who have coin'd the *Divine Right of Kings to their Kingdoms*, now begin to assert a *Divine Right of Bishops to their Dioceses*, and the *Divine Right of the Clergy to their Benefices*; and pray why not a *Divine Right of the Poor to the Alms of the Parish*? What a wild and vagrant Notion have these Men of *Divine Right*? Poor unhappy Laity! you are bound and must obey both your *Spiritual and Secular Princes*, be they never so wicked, there's no Remedy from your selves, till they are pleas'd to dissolve the Relation themselves.

§. 22. Well! but whence does this indissoluble Relation between a Bishop and his Diocese arise? Why hence, as this Gentleman tells us; "*A Man is ordain'd to somewhat, and a Bishop consecrated to somewhat, i. e. not only for the Exercise of a Ministerial or Episcopal Authority, but for the executing of it in this or that Parish or Diocese; and this before Christianity had the Protection of the Civil Government.*" Admit this, how does it appear by this account, that the Relation between the Bishop and his Diocese is indissoluble by the Civil Power? If this were true, the Dioceses of the Bishops, whom many Christian Emperors banish'd, must have remain'd vacant; which yet, we all know, were fill'd by new Bishops. Our Laws take no notice of this pretended indissoluble Relation: K. Henry VIII. dismember'd several Bishopricks, and erected five new ones by *Letters Patents*, without the least Opposition for infringing this pretended indissoluble Relation. *Tunstal* Bishop of *Durham* was depriv'd of his Bishoprick



in 1552, by a Commission from *Edward VI.* And, as was said before, the Popish Bishops and Clergy were deprived by the Civil Power in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign; whose Deprivation must have been invalid, if this Notion be true, and their Protestant Successors no less than Schismatical Intruders. And as for the Case of *Abiathar*, which I shall fully consider hereafter, 'tis so plain and so strong against the Notion of a spiritual Relation, indissoluble by Civil Power, that this Gentleman and the rest who answer the Bishop, are put to very hard Shifts to evade the Force of it. If any Set of Men might pretend to a spiritual Relation that was indissoluble, *Abiathar* and the other Descendants of *Aaron* had the greatest countenance for such a Pretence, because the Priesthood was made Hereditary in the *Aaronical* Line; yet *Solomon*, 1 Kings 2. 27. thrust him out from being Priest unto the Lord, for espousing *Adonijah's*, his elder Brother's Pretension to the Succession, before *David* was dead, or *Solomon* declar'd the Successor.

§. 23. But I will not detain your Lordship with a further Consideration of any other Particulars in this Gentleman's Papers, because they will be fully taken notice of in my Reflections upon the rest of the Answers to the *Preservative*: Tho I am unwilling to dismiss him without a Return to a Passage at the end of this Lay-Gentleman's Papers, which is this: "I cannot, says he, pag. 39. help thinking one melancholy Consequence attends the whole Scheme of the *Preservative*, and that is, if Kings may deprive Bishops, and are therefore Heads of the Church, and the People depose Kings; the People at last will be found the Head of the Church, or superiour to him, &c." This Passage is specious, and fit to deceive: But to satisfy this Gentleman and his Readers, I can assure them, the Right Reverend Author of the *Preservative* has not the least thought of taking the deposing Doctrine out of the hands of the Pope. 'Tis he alone that

that claims and maintains a Power of *deposing Kings, and of imposing Tyrants*, to which no Man can be a greater Enemy than the Bishop, whether that Power be pretended to by the Pope or the People. And as to the *depriving Power*, the Bishop also is very well content it should stand upon the foot of our *Statute, Common and Canon Laws*; and that will be attended with no such melancholy Consequence, as this Gentleman would insinuate. It was but reasonable to acquaint the Gentleman with this, because he and his Friends have plainly told the World what the whole Nation is to expect from the Scheme of the Nonjurors.

And now, my Lord, I begin with the second Answer \* to the *Preservative*; and to give your Lordship an Idea of this Writer, I need only mention a Passage, *pag. 1, and 2.* "*The exact Parallel*" (says he) *between Idiots, Lunaticks, and the Popish Line, is so plain and irrefragably clear, that it can no longer sure be deem'd a Revolution* (I suppose he meant a probable Notion or Opinion) "*but a fix'd and unalterable Principle.*" In this he concurs with the Bishop so far, as to think, *Whoever should in the least pretend to dispute it, cannot put in a Claim to common Sense*, as he says the Laity do, *pag. 1.* and very justly too: tho this Passage, I confess, can hardly be reconcil'd to common Sense, however it may happen to be this Gentleman's Sense; and therefore I leave him to answer for it.

§. 24. He can't forbear shewing his great Concern for the Nonjurors; a little for the Bishop, had look'd well: he owns indeed, *pag. 3.* that "*every Act of Treason committed by Ecclesiasticks in or out of the Exercise of their Offices, comes directly under the Sanction of the Civil Powers.*" And are not treaso-

---

\* *Smith's Considerations on the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative*, *pag. 1, 2.*

nable Principles, openly maintain'd, treasonable Acts? They who disown the whole Frame and present Constitution of our Government, sure cannot pretend to ask liberty to have publick Meetings, which would be Assemblies of profess'd Rebels; yet this Gentleman, who has more regard for them than the Church and Bishop with whom he pretends to hold Communion, is become their Advocate, and is so bold as to offer at disguising the Bishop's Reasoning; for he insinuates, *that the mere Exercise of the holy Function by the Nonjuring Clergy, can do no hurt to the State.* 'Tis very true, mere praying and preaching cannot hurt the State; but praying and preaching seditiously may, and the assembling of Persons of seditious and traitorous Principles may; which is what the Bishop by his Principles plainly opposes. And to state the Case otherwise, looks like a Design to render the Bishop or his Notions odious; as indeed several Passages too plainly, tho not honestly, endeavour at throughout the Book: As for instance, in pag. 4. where he pleads for a Toleration for his Friends the Nonjurors, he is pleas'd to say, *He thinks their Nonjuring ought not to be made a Reason to deprive them of Holy Orders.* Nor does the Bishop think it ought, nor does any body else that I know: But has not this Writer Sense or Candour enough to distinguish between Deprivation *ab Officio*, and Deprivation *ab Executione Officii pro hic & nunc*? Do our Acts of Parliament, or did any Civil Power in King William's, or Queen Anne's, or now in King George's Reign, take upon it to deprive the Clergy of Holy Orders for Nonjurancy? No such matter has been attempted, or so much as thought on; tho it can't be said some of them ha'nt well deserv'd it, for a most extravagant Profanation of religious Assemblies, with riotous seditious Discourses.

§. 25. *But the Exercise of the Christian Priesthood is neither Treason nor Rebellion,* says Mr. S—th, p. 10. Most certainly the proper Exercise is not; but the abusive  
Exercise



## 24 *The Bishop of BANGOR'S*

Exercise of it by several Nonjurors most certainly has been; of which he must remember some late notorious Instances among the Rebels, and I wish there were none such to be met with amongst those who have taken the Oaths. Does it become a sound Member of our Church to exasperate his Readers by insisting upon it, that the Bishop must mean a *total Deprivation*, (*Considerations*, pag. 21.) contrary to a bundance of expresse words \*, and to very plain Passages in the *Preservative*, and some of them cited by this Layman? Upon this false Supposition he enlarges, shewing *what the Apostles did, notwithstanding they were oppos'd by the Civil Power*: And who is there that doubts, that not only an *Apostle*, but every Christian is bound, as he can, to reason and persuade the World to be wise and good, all human Powers and Laws to the contrary notwithstanding? Such part of a Preacher's Office, or of a private Christian's Duty, no Civil, no Canonical Deprivation can hinder the Execution of; but if Preachers, upon Principle not disguis'd, but openly profess'd, are Enemies to a Government, and upon Principle too Friends to its greatest Enemies, has the Civil Power no Right to deprive such of their Civil Privileges? And such are their Benefices, &c. which are the Alms of the

---

\* Upon those Words of the *Act* (1 W. & M.) [deriv'd from their Offices] the Bishop glosses, saying, the Deprivation here spoken of is from a Right to execute their Office. And, p. 40. The Lay-Power does not concern it self with the Power within. And, p. 55. The Civil Power may hinder their actual Exercise of their Office, whenever, &c. And again, p. 65. It is absolutely necessary to the Being of the Civil Power, that any Ecclesiastick should be depriv'd of his Right to the Exercise of his Office, if that be inconsistent with the Safety of the State; which was the Case of Abiathar in Solomon's Reign: Now that is all that is included in the Deprivation we are speaking of, &c. And therefore tho it may be said, that Deprivations upon other Accounts must be perform'd by a spiritual Authority, yet this does not, because a Matter of a Civil Nature must belong to the Civil Power. And more to the same purpose in several other Places.

Exercise

State;

State; and their assembling Numbers of the Community, and haranguing them, who if not legally assembled, are an *unlawful Assembly*; and if besides, there be praying and preaching against the Government, 'tis a Riot. It would be strange indeed if the *State* can't preserve it self, and the publick Peace; but it can't do that, if it can't suppress Enemies of all sorts, Ecclesiasticks as well as Laymen. The Doctrine and Principles taught by the Apostles were in themselves hurtful to no Civil Government, but highly beneficial. Let the *Nonjurors* Doctrines be so too, and they need not fear Civil Deprivations: but whilst they maintain, and with a furious and extravagant Zeal, Doctrines inconsistent with the Safety of our Government, in vain would this Author skreen them, by the Case of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, pag. 22, 23. who were under the special Guidance and Conduct of the Holy Ghost in their Doctrines. And when the *Nonjurors* can work Miracles, and shew their Infallibility, as the Apostles did, we will admit they have equal Authority, and not till then.

Mr. S—*th*, pag. 23. flourishes upon the Answer of the Apostles, *Acts* 4. but who besides himself will infer from that Text, the Invalidity of Lay-Deprivations for Civil Matters, for which the Bishop only contends? This Layman's Argument must run thus: *The Apostles divinely inspir'd, and led by an infallible Spirit, would not submit to a Lay-Deprivation; ergo, others not divinely inspir'd, and not led by an infallible, but a seditious Spirit, should not, &c. The Apostles, in a Case not seditious nor traitorous, would not submit to Lay-Deprivations, therefore others in a Case seditious and traitorous should not.*

But let us attentively consider the Case, and see if it be to the purpose. *St. Peter* and *St. John*, *Acts* 4. were seiz'd for teaching the People, and preaching thro *Jesus* the Resurrection from the Dead, ver. 2. and for preaching that *Jesus* was the true *Messias*, as in the 3d Chapter. And the Chief Priests and Rulers, &c.

ver. 5, 6. assembled, and after a Debate, agreed, ver. 17. straitly to charge St. Peter and St. John, that they speak henceforth to no Man in the Name of Jesus Christ. And the High Priest, Rulers, and Elders, &c. call'd the Apostles, and accordingly commanded them not to speak at all, nor teach in the Name of Jesus, ver. 18. This is the true Case; in which 'tis observable,

1. That the Persons here forbid to teach were *Apostles*, who had their Mission immediately from Christ, *Mat. 10.* and were miraculously confirm'd in their Divine Office by the Effusion of the Holy Ghost, *Acts 2.* whereas our Nonjuring Teachers dare pretend to no such Mission or Powers, and are not under an immediate and divine Direction, as Mr. S—th expresses it.

2. That the Doctrines taught, and the Principles held by those divinely inspir'd Apostles, were by no means seditious: they did not call in question the Title or Power of the Civil Magistrate; whereas the *Nonjurors* openly, and upon Principle, deny the Title and Authority of the King, and the whole Right of the present Civil Government.

3. That the Apostles were threatned and commanded, *Acts 4. 17, 18.* to speak henceforth to no Man, not to speak at all, nor teach in the Name of Jesus, which was a total Deprivation: whereas the *Nonjurors* are not forbid to preach or baptize in general, but are by Law hinder'd from executing their Office in this Kingdom only; where they disown the Government, and are by Principle Enemies to it. Now if the *Nonjurors* have a true Zeal to discharge their Duty, let them repair to foreign Nations, Popish or Pagan, where they own the Government; in these the Harvest is great, and there are few or no Labourers. In our Country we have learned and pious Divines enough, who own and love the Government; so that we can very well spare every *Nonjuror*, and every *Perjuror* in the Kingdom, hoping both are not many;



ny; or being assur'd at least, they are not considerable. And when 'tis consider'd that the Isles of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* are about one part in four hundred of the whole habitable Earth, the Restraint from preaching in so small a part, is far from being a total Deprivation, as this Writer continually insinuates.

4. It may be fit to consider that the Deprivation (as 'tis often call'd in the Act of Uniformity, 1662.) which affected many Hundreds, and some worthy Divines who were episcopally ordain'd, did disable such as neglected or refus'd to comply with that Act, from preaching in any Church or Chappel whatever. And accordingly great Numbers were depriv'd, and the most eminent Writers of our Church at that time justify'd that Deprivation, tho it extended to many more, and to more pious and learned Men, than are or were depriv'd for *Nonjurancy*. But the Tables are turn'd; *Deprivation of Nonconformists*, it seems, was reasonable, tho they heartily own'd the Government; but the *Deprivation of Nonjurors* is thought unreasonable, tho they profess themselves Enemies to the Government.

5. After all the Dust Mr. S—th has rais'd upon this Head, 'tis plain from his own words, pag. 40. that he does not dislike a Deprivation by Civil Powers: For (in the Case of the Popish Clergy at the beginning of the Reformation) he says, "They were not depriv'd of their *Mission*, but only of such Exercises as were an Abuse of it, and destructive of the Purity of the Church and Peace of the State." Now every body knows they were depriv'd by Act of Parliament.

§. 26. In the *Preservative*, pag. 66. the Bishop mentions the Case of *Abiathar*, 1 Kings 2. 26, 27, 35. "whom Solomon thrust out from being Priest to the Lord, and Zadok the Priest did the King put in the room of Abiathar, as the words are; that is, says the Bishop, Solomon depriv'd a High Priest of

28 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

“ the Exercise of his Function, to which he was  
 “ appointed according to the Institution of God,  
 “ and the same *Solomon* appointed another to suc-  
 “ ceed him. What can be a more exprefs Parallel  
 “ than this, of the supreme Civil Power depriving  
 “ one Ecclesiastical Person, and putting in another,  
 “ upon the sole Consideration of the Interest of the  
 “ State?” *Mr. Sm—th* is shock'd with this In-  
 stance, and with a hard shift gets thro it, but not  
 without leaving some Marks of unfair Dealing, and  
 (I really think) Scruples in his Mind. He will have,  
*thrusting Abiathar out from being Priest, to signify,*  
*taking away the Endowments of the Crown, always be-*  
*stow'd on their Persons* (I suppose he means his Prefer-  
 ments) *and his Banishment.* Well, and what was this  
 less or other than Deprivation, that is, from the  
 Execution of his Office? which is all the Bishop pro-  
 duces it for. *But it was not a total Deprivation,* says  
*Mr. Sm—th*: He means, I suppose, he was not de-  
 priv'd of his Priestly Office, or sacred Character:  
 Be it so, there's no hurt done to the Bishop's Cause.  
*Mr. Sm—th* allows *Abiathar* was depriv'd of his  
 Preferments, and banish'd, which is full enough to  
 the Bishop's purpose; for he could not act or exe-  
 cute his Office of High Priest but at *Jerusalem*, so the  
 Execution of his Office ceas'd. I would only take no-  
 tice by the by, that *Mr. Sm—th* gives a very insuffi-  
 cient Reason for his not being totally depriv'd, “ *Be-*  
 “ *cause he was call'd High Priest afterwards in the 4th*  
 “ *Chapter of 1 Kings.*” *Ans.* So he was before his  
 Deprivation, and this was enough to give him place  
 amongst all that had been and were *Solomon's* Chiefs,  
 who are *both* mention'd in the 4th Chapter.

§. 27. This Gentleman objects further, *That the*  
*Case of Abiathar can be no Parallel, because Solomon*  
*was an extraordinary Person.* He was so in some Ca-  
 ses, but in this it plainly appears, that *Solomon* dis-  
 plac'd him for his factious Adherence to *Adonijah*.

Again

Again, Mr. Sm---th objects, "That this was done, to fulfil the Word of the Lord." Yes, in the Event, but not in Solomon's Design; his Aim was to secure the Throne, by displacing his Enemies. But Mr. Sm---th "thinks his Lordship will be inclin'd, upon Review, to think it doubtful, whether it was a Deprivation in the Sense here contended." By no means; for 'tis past doubt with the Bishop, and with any attentive Reader, that it was a Deprivation of *Abiathar* from the Execution of his Priestly Office, for his Adherence to *Adonijah*, Solomon's Competitor. And let him consider the Passage a thousand times, and he can make nothing less of it. He acknowledges, pag. 27. "The Civil Power may deprive Ecclesiasticks of Dioceſe, Revenues, Honours, &c. and Life it ſelf; but not their Orders, ſo as to make them ceaſe to be Biſhops." This will be all granted him, and is already imply'd in abundance thro the Biſhop's Diſcourſe, as I have ſhewn before: So that all his firſt 27 Pages have been combating a Phantom of his own Brain, a Poſition no where maintain'd, but often caution'd againſt by the Biſhop; which when Mr. Sm---th is pleas'd to conſider well, he will be ſorry he ſhould give himſelf and the Biſhop ſo much unneceſſary Trouble, and impoſe upon his unwary Readers ſo unfairly. What muſt ſome prejudic'd Readers think of the Biſhop, when they find this Gentleman telling them very gravely, pag. 27, 28. that there's nothing in the Episcopſal or Prieſtly Office inconfiſtent with the Power of Kings, or the Security of Civil Power? Who ſays or thinks there is? What does the Gentleman mean? The Biſhop neither expreſſes nor implies any ſuch thing in his *Preservative*. Again, in pag. 30, 31. *The Function*, ſays he, ought not to be puniſh'd, but the Miſtake. If Miſtakes could be puniſh'd, I would gladly have this Gentleman's Miſtakes, tho not his Perſon, ſeverely puniſh'd; for thro want of Candour, or due Conſideration, he miſtakes ſo palpably the Biſhop's Meaning in the Points



### 30 *The Bishop of BANGOR'S*

Points upon which he pretends to argue with the Bishop, and perverts his Sentiments so grossly, that whoever reads Mr. Sm---th, and does not read the Bishop, will certainly conclude, that the Bishop maintains that *Lay-Powers can deprive Ecclesiasticks of Holy Orders*. And this Insinuation runs thro Mr. Sm---th's first 27 Pages of his *Considerations*, as I said before.

§. 28. The Gentleman in pag. 29. banters his Readers, telling them, "*That the Church of England never thought it a Contradiction to fear God, and honour the King; what then, says he, can render Denial of her Ministers necessary to the Security of the Civil Powers?*" Does not he know that the Nonjurors think it a Contradiction to fear God, and honour King *GEORGE*? Has the King then not power to secure himself and the State against such Enemies? Nay, Mr. Sm---th is so bold as to insinuate, *There's of late a Jealousy of the Function it self*; which is altogether true as to the Nonjurors: of the Sedition, and of the rebellious Principles of such, the State is, and has reason to be jealous, because they are industrious to shew them, and boast of them in all Places. "*O but it has ever been the peculiar Glory of the Church of England, not only to teach the contrary, but to condemn every Tendency (to Disloyalty he means) whether it came from Rome or Geneva.*" To teach and to practise Obedience to Government by the Rules of the Gospel, is the Duty of every Christian Church; and the Church of England has rightly stated that Duty in her Homilies: But some of her Divines have notoriously misrepresented that Duty, and laid those Stumbling-Blocks before the Nonjurors, which at this day makes them Rebels in Principle against the present Government. And whatever Opinions, contrary to Loyalty, truly so call'd, have been propagated by some, who have receiv'd their Notions from *Rome or Geneva*; I fear there are others who have imbib'd Opinions at *Oxford*

ford and Cambridge, equally dangerous to all Government, properly so call'd, and utterly inconsistent with our *Monarchy* and *Constitution*; and when they have embrac'd such false and dangerous Notions, presently they have the Assurance to call them *Oxford* or *Cambridge Loyalty*, and the *Doctrine of the Church* forsooth, skreening their pernicious Errors under those venerable Names. 'Tis by such Teachers that this Gentleman, Mr. *Sm--th*, has been unhappily influenc'd in his Opinions, which have had so great an Ascendant over his Reason, as to give him a wrong Bias, and to disable him from reading the *Preservative* with his common Intelligence or Integrity. For he goes on still to speak of *totally depriving some of their Holy Orders*, &c. as if the Civil Government had so depriv'd them, and the Bishop had vindicated such a Deprivation. And upon this false mistaken Supposition, Mr. *Sm--th* starts several Particulars, that reflect upon the Bishop and the Government too. Pag. 32. He tells his Readers, *There's a Variety of Civil Penalties, of which the Government may take its Choice*. This supposes Deprivation of Nonjurors by Act of Parliament, to be an *Ecclesiastical Penalty insisted by Civil Authority*. Let him read the Act of Uniformity, 1662. and see if he don't find the Civil Powers then enacting Deprivation, which was actually executed upon many Hundreds. However, that Deprivation was a Civil Deprivation, it did not extend to their Holy Orders, so as totally to deprive them of them; nor does a like Civil Deprivation of the Nonjurors take away their Powers conferr'd in Ordination; nor does the Government or the Bishop suppose it does. 'Tis true, the Nonjurors can't *exercise their Function here*, but the Government would be very well pleas'd if they'd withdraw and preach in the *East* or *West-Indies*. The World is wide, and when they have left *Britain*, there's still before them *Campus dicendi amplissimus*. In doing so, they'd oblige the Nation, and the poor Heathens whom they should convert;

## 32 The Bishop of BANGOR's

convert; God forbid they should stay here till they are imprison'd, banish'd, or hang'd, which Mr. Sm---th mentions, pag. 32. as some of the Civil Penalties which the Government might chuse.

§. 29. After this tedious wrangling in behalf of the Nonjurors, this Gentleman at last turns short upon them, pag. 33. for he seems frankly to condemn the "*strange Monopoly some of the Nonjurors have made of all the Sacerdotal Powers and Privileges which Christ has given to his Church, as wild and extravagant, &c.*" yet thinks the Blasphemy and "Absurdity charg'd on such a Claim of the Priesthood in general, admits of some Difficulty, &c." And after some Censure upon the Bishop, cites the whole 77th pag. of the *Preservative*. Now the following Notions of the Nonjurors are there briefly represented, and afterwards confuted by the Bishop: as, That "*there's no \* Hope of the Favour of God, but in a strict Communion with the Nonjuring Church, which is govern'd by a regular Succession of Bishops: That God dispenses his Favours only by their Hands, and their subordinate Priests: That you can't be authoritatively bless'd, or releas'd from your Sins, but by them who are the Regular Priests: That Churches under other Bishops are schismatical, excommunicate, out of God's Favour.*" Now tho Mr. Sm---th blames the Nonjurors for appropriating the Sacerdotal Powers and Privileges to themselves, yet he thinks the Bishop to blame for seeming to disallow of such Powers to the Clergy in general. And he's so impatient of venting his Sentiments, that he takes up the Bishop upon a general Clause, that's only preparatory to his following Arguments, and tells him, "*He should not content himself, were there nothing to be said to either Papist or Protestant, but a general Harangue on the Justice and Goodness of God.*" Nor does the Bishop desire his Readers, to

---

\* Principles of the Nonjurors.



be content with this, but furnishes them with Arguments that are in themselves satisfactory, and plainly overthrow the Foundation of the *Nonjurors Scheme*.

But this Gentleman begins with new Insinuations: "I must own, says he, *Regular Ordination, Authoritative Benediction, Remission, and the like, are Words that seem to me to carry a good old meaning.*" Yes Sir, those words do more than seem, they do really contain in them a good Sense, and they also have been apply'd to very ill Purposes, as you your self observe, by *Papists and Nonjurors*; and 'tis their ill-grounded and superstitious Sense alone that the Bishop confutes; which if you had duly heeded, all the Trouble you are at to justify a *regular Mission* would have been excus'd: for that was always thought reasonable, and will be always contended for by wise and good Men, particularly by the Bishop of Bangor: And *Authoritative Benediction and Absolution* are certainly good things, if by them we understand a Declaration, according to the Word of God, of his Favour and Good-will to the Pious and Penitent. And if Mr. S---th also will understand, by *Authoritative Binding or Anathematizing, a Denunciation according to the Word of God, of his Wrath and Displeasure against the Impious and Impenitent*; this will readily be agreed. But if he or any others, *Papists or Protestants*, amuse themselves with superstitious and dark Notions of certain Powers lodg'd in some Persons, and will have these to be necessary to our Salvation, they must prove it by plainer and stronger Arguments than have yet been offer'd by any *Popish or Protestant Hand*.

That *Christ, after his Ascension, gave some Apostles, &c.* and gave them too extraordinary Powers, is not, cannot be deny'd.

That Persons of the best Qualifications, ought to have a regular Ordination or Appointment to the Ministry, will be readily granted.

E

That

### 34 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

That such ought to be held in due Esteem for their Work and Office, as the Instruments under God, and Helps to us in working out our Salvation, is certainly true.

That such can and ought, by Authority from the Word of God, to declare his Favour to *them that do well*, and his Wrath against *them that do Evil*, is most certain.

But that all the Powers convey'd to the Apostles by our Saviour, *Mat. 16. & 19. and 18. 18. and John 20. 23.* are in the same Degree and Kind convey'd from the Apostles by a regular Succession of certain Persons, down to the Clergy of the present Age, of any Communion; or that *Binding and Loosing, Retaining and Remitting, Blessing and Cursing*, are so intirely the Property and Prerogative of Persons in Holy Orders, that they alone have the sole Disposal of them; or that these things, in passing thro their hands, and by being dispens'd by them, have a singular Energy and peculiar Effects; or that constant recourse is to be had to the Clergy, by Confession, for Remission, or for their Benediction; are Notions not to be met with in the Holy Scriptures, nor maintain'd by the best Authority in the Church of *England*. But 'tis the Custom of others, and the Practice of this Writer, *pag. 35.* presently to conclude, if their Notions of Priestly Powers are deny'd, or call'd in question, immediately to insinuate, that a regular Ordination is disown'd. Even this Writer has the Modesty to intimate, that a *regular outward Call to the Ministry*, is by the Bishop deem'd a *Nicety*, than which nothing can be more untruly suggested. Yet this is not the last, nor the least Imposition by Mr. *Sm---th* upon his Readers: His Misrepresentations of the Bishop come on thick in every Page, and seem to be altogether wilful, which have greatly surpriz'd his Readers in the 39th, 40th, 41st and 42d Pages; and 'tis not easy to say, whether they deserve more Pity or Indignation, because

because they are, to any thing the Bishop has said in his *Preservative*, altogether foreign and impertinent.

§. 30. The Bishop is shewing, pag. 85, 86, 87. what Principle it is that justify'd the Protestants in setting up their own Bishops, and separating from the Church of *Rome*; and says, and that very truly too, that 'twas *because the Protestants were persuaded, in their own Consciences, that the Popish Doctrines and Worship were corrupt*. Who would think now that what is so just, and so certain as this, with the Illustration that follows, could offend, or that so plain and evident a Truth could be mistaken by Mr. Sm---th? But so it is, for he makes this, pag. 43. *to be resolving all Religion into an honest and sincere Persuasion*. And upon this extravagant Construction he sets out with a fresh Retinue of trifling and absurd Reflections, which a reasonable Man would wonder should ever enter into his Head, upon reading those Pages in the *Preservative*. What! because one ought, to justify one's Separation, to be sincerely persuaded of the Reasons and Grounds for it, will it follow, that all our Religion is resolv'd into that Persuasion? Or that such Persuasion is attain'd, without a sincere Use of the *Holy Scriptures*? Or that the Bishop had the least Thought, that a *Protestant* could arrive at such a Persuasion, without carefully reading the Word of God? Or that the *Scriptures* are not the Foundation of all our Religion?

§. 31. In the 45th Page, Mr. Sm---th falls foul upon the Bishop, with these words: "I would be the last  
" that should quarrel about Words; but to find that  
" Authority invested in the Christian Priesthood, by Di-  
" vine Institution, of blessing and absolving the People,  
" mention'd by your Lordship, with an Air of Con-  
" tempt and Disdain, gives me abundance of Concern.  
" Authoritative Benediction, a Term of Art! sure, my  
" Lord, 'tis the Doctrine of our Church, it's the Doc-  
" trine of the Holy Scriptures." Now all this is said,



## 36 The Bishop of BANGOR'S

without explaining his Terms, or attempting to prove his Notion of blessing and absolving the People from the Word of God, without which it cannot be of Divine Institution.

§.32. He offers indeed to prove it to be the Doctrine of our Church, from these words; "*He hath given Power and Commandment to his Ministers to declare and pronounce to his People, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their Sins: He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, &c.*" But this is nothing at all to his Authoritative Benediction, and plainly against his *Authoritative Absolution vested in the Christian Priesthood by Divine Institution*. For, (1.) the words are exprefs, that *God hath given Power and Commandment to declare and pronounce Absolution and Remission*; not to absolve and to remit. (2.) 'Tis as exprefs, that *He* (that is, God) *pardoneth and absolveth, &c.* This is the modest, the cautious, the prudent, and humble Stile of our Church concerning *Absolution*. And in the Office for the Sick, the first part of the Absolution is merely *optative* or *precatory* (and so is that in the Communion-Service) that is, a wishing or praying, *that our Lord, &c. of his great Mercy would forgive, &c.* The latter part is exprefs'd with an Air of authoritative Absolution, *By his Authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy Sins*. But then this must be explain'd by the former Absolution, which is fuller and plainer; and then the *Authority* committed to the Priest, is an Authority only to *declare and pronounce* to the truly Penitent: and when the Priest says, *I absolve thee from all thy Sins*, it must be understood, *I declare, that God absolves thee from all thy Sins*; otherwise it could not agree with what is expressly said in the first Absolution, *viz. That God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent*. Besides, it being impossible the Priest should know who truly repents, 'tis consequently impossible for him to absolve in any other Sense, than declaring,

declaring, that God absolveth all that truly repent: If he absolves in any other Sense, his Absolution can signify nothing but much Confidence or Ignorance. And further, that the words aforesaid [*I absolve thee from all thy Sins*] signify no more than if the Priest had said, I declare thee, if truly penitent, absolv'd, &c. plainly appears from the *Collect* immediately following, wherein the Church has order'd the absolving Priest to pray, *Consider his* (the sick Person's) *Contrition*—*accept his Tears*,—*impute not to him his former Sins*. All which Petitions were needless, if the Party had been absolutely and certainly absolv'd before; which 'tis plain by this, the Church acknowledges was not done; and that she did not intend any such Absolution should be put into the Mouth of her Ministers, who can have no means to know when they may apply it infallibly: and consequently, as the Bishop has well express'd it, *An infallible Absolution cannot belong to fallible Men*. To this Passage, after some nibbling, Mr. Sm---th is pleas'd to say, pag. 48. "*If your Lordship means an infallible Absolution cannot come from, or be pronounc'd by Man, I deny it flatly*: But for what Reason does he deny it? why this remarkable one, "*If God vouchsafes to give such a Power to Man, so far as that Power extends, it must be infallible*. Wisely said! But does God give such a Power? that is what remains to be prov'd. Can fallible Men, without Inspiration, exercise such a Power? The Apostles indeed might, because our Saviour, *John 20. 22.* inspir'd them for that purpose, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever Sins, &c.* But without such Inspiration, who dares say I absolve, or pardon, with Certainty?

§. 33. What therefore Mr. Sm---th flatly denies, viz. *that an infallible Absolution cannot be pronounc'd by fallible Man*, may be readily affirm'd with the greatest Certainty. Indeed he is pleas'd to say, that "*when God Almighty expressly orders a Mini-*  
*ster*

### 38. The Bishop of BANGOR's

"ster to say, Thy Sins are forgiven, I am as infallibly sure they are so, as if I heard a Voice my self from Heaven." All Divines hitherto have taught us, that our Assurance of our Forgiveness depends upon our being conscious, that we have heartily and sincerely repented, and without immediate Revelation we can have none other Assurance. But here's a Gentleman, who is assur'd by the Priest's Assurance, not by his own. If the Priest be assur'd he has power to absolve, then he is sure his Sins are forgiven. I'm afraid that won't follow: for either this Gentleman, when absolv'd by a Priest, is a true Penitent, or he is not; if he be, then his Assurance of Forgiveness comes not from his opinionative Power of the Priest, but from his own Sense, that he is one qualify'd for Pardon by the Terms of the Gospel. But if he be not a true Penitent, then a thousand Priestly Absolutions, be they ever so absolute and peremptory, will do him no Service; and let the Priest be ever so sure of his own Power, he can never assure an impenitent Sinner of Pardon, who understands the Terms of Forgiveness in the Gospel: Upon a sincere Compliance with which Terms we are certainly forgiven by God, and may securely depend upon it, tho all the Priests in *Christendom* should refuse us Absolution, or even anathematize us.

§. 34. 'Tis pleasant to observe how he trifles, p. 47. He begins indeed with a seeming serious Air, "*Perhaps we shall better understand this Controversy, if we state it in a logical View.*" Then having recited some words of the Bishop, he comes off instantly from his *logical View*, in this abject manner; "*I leave the Learned to quarrel about Mode and Figure.*" And well he may; he has some Modesty left to restrain him; if his Stock had been greater, he had not laid down his *Ha—er* to take up the *Pen*, which by no means is the Province of every *Demetrius*. He may repeat his Assertions about  
God's



God's appointing a Set of Men, as his words are, pag. 48, 49. and of his impowering them to act in his stead, and urge the Expediency of it as often and as dogmatically as he pleases; unless he could plainly and clearly state his own Notion of the Priestly Powers, or had carefully observ'd what the Bishop has said about Authoritative Absolution, his intermeddling in this Affair will signify nothing, but to amuse himself, and divert the Publick.

§. 35. His Recital of the common Texts that are produc'd in these Debates, signify nothing from his Pen; because he can neither explain them, nor apply them to his purpose. I wish he took a little more heed to quote the words right, which he has not done, *Mat. 18. 18.* and to write intelligibly, which he has not done, pag. 50. and in several other Places. And as for Candour, if he knows the true meaning of the Word, he seems to have no regard for the thing; why else does he upon the least Occasion, and from no Occasion given him, divert from honest and useful Observations to invidious Reflections? pag. 51. What need was there of his "*modern Notions of Protestantism, Levities from the Genius of a Mughouse, or the Pen of a News-Writer, &c.*" unless it be natural to him to be dull, and to be rude? "O but the Text, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c. John 20. 23.* has been deem'd so plenary a Proof of such a Power, that it's urg'd by Divines of all sorts for that purpose." Has this Gentleman seen, and read, and well consider'd what has been written by Divines of all Denominations upon these Points, that he's so positive? Have all the Commentators been perus'd by him? He would have his Readers believe this, for he has the Vanity to use these words; *Divines of all sorts, and Commentators of all sorts. Quis expedit psittaco suum xaiqe? Quis Demetrium instituit, Bibliothecam Vaticanam, & Theologos crepare?*

40 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

§. 36. He acknowledges, p. 52. which is a Favour,  
 " That some Powers conferr'd on the Apostles were in-  
 " tirely miraculous, and were not convey'd to their  
 " Successors; but the Power of remitting and retaining  
 " is not so esteem'd, he says, by any of the Commen-  
 " tators, but is by them all mention'd as that ordinary  
 " and stated Power, which was promis'd to the Church  
 " till the end of the World." By any of the Commen-  
 " tators, and by all of them, methinks are Words too  
 " great for little Demetrius, and too false for a modest  
 " Man to use. However they are but Words, and  
 " vain ones too out of his Mouth. Commentators we  
 " know, and Criticks we know; but who are you, Sir?  
 " and what is the precise Notion of remitting and re-  
 " taining you contend for? Dr. Brett, in his *Doctrine*  
 " of Remission explain'd and vindicated, pag. 51. tells  
 " us what he understands by Absolution, and the De-  
 " scription is penn'd pretty cautiously, tho' (if I right-  
 " ly understand him) he makes the Remission of Sins  
 " to be the Effect of the Priest's Declaration and Pro-  
 " nunciation of it; a Notion, I think, that can ne-  
 " ver be prov'd: for certainly Pardon of Sins is the  
 " pure and sole Effect of the Divine Mercy and  
 " Goodness, and the Apostles themselves could be no  
 " further concern'd in it, than to declare it, tho' they  
 " could declare and pronounce it absolutely to such,  
 " of whose State they had receiv'd immediate Reve-  
 " lation; that is, they could with Certainty tell such,  
 " that God had pardon'd them: but none who are  
 " call'd their Successors can declare peremptorily and

---

*The Author of the Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, speaking of the Absolution in the Primitive Church, says, pag. 93. That Absolution regarded the Sinner's Conscience, or relax'd the Censures of the Church: The first Absolution was by interceding with God for the Sinner's Forgiveness; the second declar'd him releas'd from the Ecclesiastical Censure. The first kind of Absolution, says he, was always in Form of a Prayer throughout the earliest Ages, and continu'd so for a thousand years.*

effectually,

effectually, *I pardon you, I absolve you, &c.* because they have not the same measure of the Spirit. Nor will or can Remission follow, as an Effect from any Declaration made by any Person whatever, it being the certain, proper, and genuine Effect of the Divine Mercy and Goodness alone. Men may make known God's Grace and Favour to Penitents; but He alone can originally and authoritatively forgive: for 'tis his Laws and his Authority as a Governor that the Sinner violates, and therefore 'tis he alone that can remit the Punishment. All the Power that was certainly convey'd by our Saviour to the Apostles, by these words, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, &c.* they undoubtedly exercis'd; but the most learned Interpreters of any Communion are very cautious in pronouncing, that they have attain'd the adequate and intire Sense of those Words.

Yet all Interpreters of Note are agreed, that the Apostles, in some Instances of their Power and Authority, had no Successors; and most certainly they have none, who can now remit and retain Sins by the same Divine Direction as they did. And till Divines can with Certainty, and by infallible Knowledge, distinguish the Sincere from the Hypocrites, a *peremptory and indicative Absolution is an Act of the highest Presumption.* And to think such Absolution has any Efficacy for the Pardon of Sins, is, as Dr. Cannon \* truly says, gross Superstition. Mr. Smith thinks a little Gravity, and some good Words, will do with his Readers; especially if he can but talk of Commentators, and cite some insufficient Passages from two or three of that Number. If he can read the *Critici Sacri*, and understand them well, he may see Cause to alter his Opinion; and for the present I will abide by the Sense of our Church in this matter, where she has express'd her Sense of

---

\* Account of two Motions in Convocation, p. 12.



## 42 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

Absolution in the plainest Terms, viz. *He* (that is, God) *hath given Power and Commandment to his Ministers to declare and pronounce to his People, being penitent, &c.* And *He*, that is, God pardoneth, and not the Priest pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his Holy Gospel. Upon which it follows, *Wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true Repentance, &c.* that is, that God may pardon us. By which 'tis evident beyond all dispute, that in this Absolution the Minister only declares the Terms upon which God will absolve, viz. true Repentance, and an unfeign'd Belief of the Holy Gospel. And that is indeed all that he has Power to do in the Case: unless he be a Judge in an Ecclesiastical Court, then indeed he has by the *Canons* a Power, *Solvere nexus sive vincula Juris*, i. e. to absolve one from the Censures or Sentence of the Court.

§. 37. Mr. *S---* proceeds to cite an Excellent Passage out of the *Preservative*, pag. 93, 94. which if his Readers look into, they must blush for the Confidence of this weak Man, who has first left the word [*such*] out of the last Clause in the Paragraph, and so made the words Run, "*Therefore it can't be the true Intent of this Passage, [John 20. 21, 22, 23.] to give any Power to Men*"; whereas the Bishop's Words are—*any such Power to Men*: Pointing by that word [*such*] to a Power to absolve, suppos'd to be lodg'd in Priests (which he had spoken of a few Lines before) without which God wou'd not pardon Sinners. I leave the Readers to judge whether such a notorious Perversion was an effect of Mr. *Sm---*'s Care or his Candor.

§. 38. I don't see how he cou'd read and cite the next Paragraph out of the 94th Page of the *Preservative*, without being rightly inform'd how far any one besides the Supreme Being, is concern'd in Absolution, &c. But he goes on with Mistake upon Mistake, and with one Perversion after another; that

that to trace 'em wou'd be endless trifling. For he neither understands the Bishop nor himself; nor can be well understood in many places by his Readers. Yet, thus much is very plain, that he knows very little of this Controversy. Wou'd any Man, who is in his right Mind, affirm, as Mr. Sm---th does, pag. 57. "*That God wou'd most certainly pardon such as were orally pronounc'd absolv'd by a Regular Priest, by virtue of his Mission?*" Can any thing be more Stupid or Popish than that Assertion? Yet he asks, "*If the Ministers of God had not ever such a Power?*" And positively says, "*That God ratifies and confirms in Heaven, what they (that is his Priests) do of this kind on Earth.*" Which Notion is directly contrary to Scripture and Reason. The Scriptures teach expressly, *That God only can forgive Sin.* We are also taught in the Lord's Prayer, and in very many places of *our Common Prayer*, to ask forgiveness of God alone. Had a Priest such a Power delegated to him, it wou'd be a proper and a reasonable Act to beg forgiveness of the Priest; and if he orally pronounc'd Absolution, God wou'd be oblig'd, according to Mr. Sm---th, to ratify the Act of his own Commissioner. But 'tis impossible for any Bishop or Priest in the whole Christian Church to shew a Commission from the Holy Scriptures (they may from the Pope, I grant) to pardon and absolve this or that individual Person, otherwise than conditionally; or in any other Sense than this: *If you truly and sincerely Repent, &c. I do assure you from the Word of God that he pardons and absolves you; for he has requir'd us Ministers to declare his Pardon to true Penitents* \*. 'Tis very observable, and deserves to be

---

\* And the Fathers teach the same very fully, which Mr. Sm---th may read in the Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, Publish'd 1714. pag. 95, 96, 97. *Ibid.* The Priests only intercede with God, and pray to God for the Sinner: But 'tis certain,

be often and well consider'd by *Priests* and *People*, that our Blessed Saviour pronounces his Absolution in this humble manner in three Evangelists, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*. But some of his Ministers and Messengers have learn'd to speak in the peremptory Form, *I absolve thee from all thy Sins*; putting (as it were) themselves in God's stead with the highest Arrogance.

This indicative, peremptory, and presumptuous Form of Absolution is modern, as may be seen in Dr. Cannon's *Account of two Motions in Convocation* 1712. and more at large in a Book, entitled, *The Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, &c.* printed 1714\*. If any Priest has receiv'd a special Revelation from God of the State of a Person, and of God's gracious Intention towards that Person, then let him declare the Person absolv'd with as much Assurance, as he will: But even then, in such a case, the Priest can only declare to that Penitent what he certainly knows in the form our blessed Saviour us'd, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, or to that effect. But without such Revelation he cannot possibly take upon him to declare, in the Name of God, this or that particular Person to be forgiven; because he dares not declare what he is not sure of: and without Revelation every Priest is, and must be uncertain, both as to the Will of God, and the State of particular Persons. In the present State of the Christian Church then, our Divines having no immediate Revelation from God of his special Grace to this or that Person, nor of the State of particular Persons; they can only declare in general,

---

certain, says the Author, God only doth pardon; for which he produces express Authorities from St. Ambrose, Clem. Alexandrinus, St. Basil, St. Cyprian, and Aquinas.

\* Where the Author says, this direct and peremptory Form was ordered to be us'd by Cardinal Othobon, &c. 1268. Vide Plura, p. 93, 98, — 200 — 209, 211, 212, 213. & Appendix.

that



that God pardons and absolves all them that truly Repent, &c. as our Church speaks : or, which is the same in other words ; If you truly and sincerely Repent, I declare that God has forgiven your Sins. 'Tis a plain case ; let any sober and wise Man consider it seriously, and he will find the Authority of the Priest neither doth, nor can reach any further. In this view of the point, Mr. Sm---th may rectify his Notion, without my laying open any more of his Mistakes ; which wou'd be troublesome, and of no use to him or my Readers. What God authorizes Men to do, he certainly enables them to do. He authoriz'd (*John 20. 22, 23.*) and enabled the Apostles to Remit and Retain Sins ; i. e. according to the best Interpreters, to declare such pardon'd, whom they knew by his Spirit he had pardon'd ; and to undertake to heal such miraculously, whom they knew God intended to heal, &c. This was what God authoriz'd the Apostles to do. But he has not, nor the Apostles have not authoriz'd any Persons to do the like in this Age, because he has not enabled 'em by an infallible Knowledge of the case of Individuals, nor of his Will concerning them. Nor does God by that Text promise, nor indeed by any other, that such miraculous Remission as attended the Apostles, shou'd descend in a regular Succession : Remission, now, is no more than a general Declaration, and an Assurance to the Penitent by the Priest from the Word of God, that their Sins are forgiven. This is all that can be made of it, if Men should write on to the World's end ; and truly is what every one has cause to be greatly thankful for to the Divine Goodness. To declare Remission, or to absolve in this Sense, every Priest has a Divine Authority, or Commission, as (some word it) and beyond this he has none, and can have none from the Gospel ; tho' he may have pretended Authority, and a plenary Commission from the Roman Pontif, as Father

Tekel

# 46      *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

*Tekel* had at the beginning of the *Reformation*. But the times of such gross Ignorance and Superstition are, I hope, at an end in *Britain*. And tho \* two or three Learned Divines have of late unwarily express'd themselves in this matter in a Controversy that was reviv'd, and not thoroughly studied of late; yet I dare say they have a horror for every thing in *Poper*y: and tho I am utterly a Stranger to those learned Gentlemen, yet I believe 'em to be Persons of that Ability and Integrity, that I can almost assure my self, they by this time have better consider'd this point, which is so well explain'd, and set in so true and clear a Light by the Bishop's *Preservative*, that I wou'd hope even Mr. *Sm---th* himself, divested of his warm Prejudices, might upon a cool Review see cause to amend his Notions; which I heartily wish he may, because his Diligence is commendable: which when accompanied with more Judgment and Modesty, will hereafter make his Reading more useful to himself, and his Writing less troublesome to the World.

§. 39. If Mr. *Sm---th* had been careful and attentive, would he in this Controversy have cited two large Passages from Dr. *Cave's Primitive Christianity* concerning *Church-Censures*, which are so wide from the Point the Bishop discourses upon? Nothing but very great Inadvertency can excuse so *aliene, so impertinent a Citation*. No body doubts, whether the Church has power to excommunicate Offenders, and receive Penitents; or whether she can relax, abate, or entirely remit her *own Censures*. But the Point the Bishop is upon, is to shew that no Man has Authority from God to remit or retain Sins in God's stead; or to declare Remission to particular Men, without special Revelation. All therefore that Dr. *Cave* says in Mr. *Sm---th's* Citations, may be, and is readily granted. And so might good

---

\* Dr. Brett.    *Mr. Archdeacon Hill.*

part of what follows, at another time and upon another occasion, separate from the many Mistakes and undutiful Insinuations scatter'd up and down in every Page; which are the more culpable in Mr. *Sm—th*, because of his many and solemn Expressions of the greatest Veneration for the Ministers of God: amongst whom he must, upon his own Principles, acknowledge the *Bishop of Bangor* to be in the first Rank.

§. 40. What Opinion Mr. *Sm—th* has of himself and his Readers, is very plain. I who have been one of 'em, pity him, and wish him more Wisdom and Modesty. If the most candid Reader were to cast his Eye first upon the bottom of his 74th Page, and find him summing up his Discourse in one general view, thus; "Whether we consider the express Decisions of Scripture, the Sense of the Fathers, of all Commentators, the publick and most authentick Voice of the Church, the Perplexity and Uncertainty of the Bishop. \* " I say, whoever shou'd read this Passage first, wou'd certainly expect to find Texts learnedly handled; the Fathers copiously cited; all the Commentors produced, and the Sense of the Church fully and clearly stated; and, in fine, the Bishop's Arguments entirely refuted. *At, quid ferat hic tanto dignum promissor hiatus?* He jingles with the Texts, as a Morice-Dancer does with his Bells. He mangles three *English* Commentators, and slights all the rest, pag. 53. He cites none of the Fathers, but one Father *Cave*, who dy'd about half a score Years ago; and him quite besides his purpose. For the Sense of the Church, he only names a line or two from the Liturgy. And for the Bishop's Words and Arguments, Mr. *Sm—th*, in almost every Page, mistakes and perverts 'em, yet in so weak, and often in so ridiculous a manner, that

---

\* This Learned Gentleman has forgot to cite the Councils; but in the next Edition we shall have large Authorities from them.



48 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

his Friends blush, and his Adversaries smile, not without a just Contempt. He pretends, pag. 76. a mighty Veneration for the Gown; yet neither the Habit nor the Order, neither the Learning nor the real Services done for our Church and Nation by the Bishop of *Bangor*, do secure him from Mr. *Sm---th's* ignorant and impertinent Remarks. So that 'tis manifest his Respect is confin'd to his Favourites, the rest have an indefeasible Right to his Hatred. Why else so much freedom with the Bishop, the most inoffensive Man in his Life and Writings? I'll refer Mr. *Sm---th* himself to the foot of his 80th and 81st pages for an instance, but not of his Good Manners, or his Understanding; and to the 79th page for his impartial Treatment of the Bishop and Mr. *Sm---th's* own Readers; who are egregiously abus'd by his Misrepresentations, as if the Bishop asserted that *Clergymen might be totally depriv'd of their Holy Orders by the Civil Powers, and made a jest of Sacerdotal Blessings and Curses*, pag. 81. All Mr. *Sm---th's* Profession, tho' ever so solemn, of being unbiass'd and without personal or Party-Regards, and the sorry Excuse he attempts to make for his warmth in the same Page, are of the same piece with the Pamphlet, wonderfully modest and candid. What he presents his Readers with, flows, as he tells 'em, from the sincere *Dictates of his Conscience*; which upon my word is a melancholy account of the State of Mr. *Sm---th's* Mind, and deserves our Pity, and his further Consideration.

§. 41. As for *Party-Words* (against which he declares) they are wicked in their Design and their Consequences; distracting the People, and dividing the Nation. But (begging his pardon) *King George for ever*, is not and cannot be a Party-word; for 'tis the Sense of *Whig and Tory Parliaments* in their *Votes*, their *Acts*, their *Oaths* for many Years, which makes it the Sense of the Nation, and not of a Party, as this Gentleman would boldly insinuate. Tho' *High Church*,

*Church*, &c. is a scandalous Party-Word affected by *Mobs*, and others who by their *Rank* or their *Function* shou'd know better, who violate all Oaths, and the most Sacred Bonds of Charity, &c. and seem to condemn and detest the Name of Protestant; because those who are fond of that Name differ in some lesser Matters, who nevertheless agree in the weightier Matters of the Christian Law. The Papists might, methinks, teach this Gentleman, and others too a little Temper and Prudence; for they style *Franciscans* and *Dominicans*, *Jansenists* and *Molinists*, &c. all *Catholicks*, tho pretty widely differing, and warmly opposing each other. Whereas this Gentleman is so offended at the calling some *our Protestant Brethren*, who hold the great Fundamental of the Christian Religion, viz. *That the Scriptures are the only Rule of Faith and Life*; that he forgets his Grammar, and can hardly be said to speak Sense, pag. 83, 84. However, he hopes to recompense his Readers by his Zeal, which is as blind as his worst Enemies cou'd wish it. 'Twill be some excuse for him, if it be as honest as 'tis blind: tho that may be justly question'd by several Passages. But for that let him stand or fall, not by his own Conscience, for that mayn't do its Office, but at a juster Tribunal, where he will find Absolution and Malediction too, impartially pronounc'd, not according to *Parties* in the *State*, or *Sects* and *Communities* in the Church; not according to the vain Opinions of *Orthodoxy* or *Heterodoxy*, Assent to or Dissent from *Human Establishments*; but according to the Piety and Sincerity of our Hearts, and the Simplicity and Integrity of our Lives.

Sovereign Princes will not be exempt from this Tryal, however privileg'd by their Characters here on Earth. Then the true Cause of the *Popery* of King Charles and James the Second will be certainly known, which Mr. Sm--th and others (always in a Passion) ascribe to their *Exile*, and that *Exile* to the Civil

*War* in the last Century; but tho' this may be true, 'tis but part of the Truth: For the *Civil War* is by my Lord *Clarendon* himself plainly intimated to have taken its Rise from the *Popish and violent Counsels*, and ill Conduct of the *Court*; and the *Popery* of the two *Royal Brothers* must first be charg'd upon a private Education in the *Romish Religion*, during the first thirteen Years of their Youth, according to those famous Articles of Marriage between *Charles I.* and the Princess *Henrietta* of *France*. And the indefatigable Zeal of his *Popish Queen* and her *Romish Priests* lost no time, and spar'd no pains, without question, to secure the young Princes in a *Popish Interest*; for which the Nation has smarted above fifty Years, and is like to do so for fifty Years to come, because some wicked Men make it their business to disguise and misrepresent Persons and Things; being always sure of numbers of weak and credulous Men, upon whom they may impose the foolishhest and the falsest things in the World, under the specious Names of *Church* and *Monarchy*. From our cunning *Tricksters* in Church and State, Mr. *Sm--th* has unhappily receiv'd some Impressions, which riper Years and better Consideration may hereafter rectify; a Happiness I heartily wish him, and for which I shou'd with great pleasure congratulate him.

§. 42. My Lord, A third Hand lifted up against the Bishop is a Gentleman, who tells us he has publish'd *Elements of Policy Civil and Ecclesiastical, in a Mathematical Method*. From such a Hand something considerable might have been expected; but so it is, that the *Preservative*, tho' it self one of the exactest Pieces on the Subject that yet has seen the light, has met with the dullest and rudest Answers. Mr. *M. E.* takes upon him to vindicate the *Old English Constitution*, but then 'tis an *English Constitution* before there were either *Commons* or *Lords*, which he supposes had not, *ab Origine*, any share in the *Legislature*, and obtain'd



obtain'd it at last by Royal Grace and Favour. This is what *Filmer*, and some other obscure Names were driving at in the Reign of *Charles II.*

§. 43. Mr. *Petyt*, and since him Mr. *Tyrrel*, have said enough to satisfy any judicious unprejudic'd Reader of the *Antiquity of the House of Commons*, &c. But this *Vindicator of our Old English Constitution* is a profess'd Enemy to *Parliaments*, and so are his Party; feign wou'd they extinguish that glorious *Assembly*, in which all our Relief and Security lies. They are for, not the present *Constitution of King, Lords and Commons*, tho that has been the Constitution above 450 Years, as is granted by these very *Anti-Parliamentarians*; but they are for a Prince governing by Absolute Power, without the Restraint of Laws or *Parliaments*, which is such an *Old English Constitution* as was never in *Rerum Naturâ*.

§. 44. I don't find the *Commons* descended to take notice of that false and insolent Assertion of *Filmer's*, much less do I think this *Trifler Mr. E.* will be regarded by our present *House of Commons* — *Aquila non capit Muscas.* — They have greater Affairs to mind, yet it mayn't be amiss for some private Hand to instruct and chastise this bold Pretender to Antiquity and Argument.

In his Preface, pag. 1. he says, "A Stranger to the Controversy wou'd imagine that *Parliaments* were as Antient at least as the Flood, and that a House of Commons was preserv'd in Noah's Ark."

Let me tell him, as much as he intends this for elegant Banter, I can assure him 'tis Truth to a tittle. I suppose it will be granted in this, as well as in all other Cases, *De Nomine Contentio est Supervacua, cum de Re ipsâ constiterit.* No body thinks the Word *Parliament* to be above 7 or \* 800 Years old; but Assemblies of the People, or their Chiefs and Re-

---

\* Lord Coke's *Instit.* p. 1. §. 164.

representatives in all Nations upon Emergent Publick Occasions, to consult and determine of their own Affairs, has been a practice so universal as to Time and Place, where not hinder'd by Tyrannick, Military and Despotick Princes, that all the Histories of Nations now extant afford plain footsteps in this matter; which a prejudic'd Man may slight, but cannot fairly deny.

§. 45. The Style and Title of such *Assemblies* may indeed change with Language, which is a thing continually changing; and the Names or Designations of the *Constituents* may alter; as is apparent in the present case: but it has ever been the immutable and constant Practice of *Civiliz'd and Well-govern'd Nations* to meet in *General Assemblies*, to advise, debate, and finally determine concerning their *Publick National Concerns*.

§. 46. That this was our Case in *Britain* before *Christ's* time, is clear from *Jul. Caesar's Account. Com. l. 5.* where he says, "*Summa Imperii bellicque administrationi Communi Concilio permissa est Cassivellano.*" \* And the same appears to have been the Case in *Gaul*, *l. 7. Commentar.* "*Re in Controversiam deducta, Totius Gallie Concilium Bibracte indicitur; eodem convenient undique frequentes multitudines. Suffragiis res permittitur, ad unum omnes Vercingetorigem probant Imperatorem—*" And *Tacitus* in his *Germania* gives the like account of that Country in these Words "*—De minoribus Rebus Principes consultant, de majoribus Omnes.*" To descend lower, wou'd exceed the bounds of this Paper; and the Subject has been unanswerably manag'd by *Mr. Peryt* in his *Antiquity and Power, &c. of the House of Commons*; and by *Mr. Tyrrel* in his *Bibliotheca Politica*, and his learned Preface to his *History of England*, which no Writer of Note has hitherto undertaken to confute; and

---

\* The *Mirror of Justice* cited ut supra by Lord Coke, mentions an *Assembly of the Counties, &c.* in *King Alfred's Reign.*

last of all by Mr. Rymer, whose *Fœdera* Mr. E. has cited so often.

§. 47. To the *Lords* Mr. E. is pleas'd to allow a greater Antiquity, which is so notorious an Error, in point of fact, that one wou'd wonder how a Person who has dipp'd into History with Judgment cou'd assert it. He might from *Selden*, and our *Chronicles*, have observ'd, that the Distinctions of *Peerage* now in Use are not of that great Antiquity; but National Assemblies have been always in Use.

§. 48. 'Tis the *Unhappiness of Mankind*, Mr. E. tells us, Pref. p. 5. "That since the Creation they have been led into Error, by not setting a right Signification upon Words." Which Observation is most true in the Case before us: because *Superficial Examiners* don't in their reading the Antients meet with Modern Words and Phrases, 'tis presently concluded, that the things intended by those Words, were not in Being or Practice in former Ages.

§. 49. It wou'd be endless to copy and answer the many Mistakes and bold Reflections of Mr. E. throughout his Book. The whole is a Miscellaneous Libel against our Constitution, without Method or Discretion; and the Author wou'd deserve one's pity, if his Confidence and Bigotry did not make him unworthy of it. He is not content our Kings should be only a Branch of the Supreme Power, which yet was as much as King *Charles I.* insisted upon, in his Answer to the *Commons* about *Hull*; and in his *Answer to the nineteen Propositions*, \* "Knowing very well, says that King, the great and unlimited Power of Parliaments." But Mr. E. Pref. p. 6. is for placing the Supreme Power in the King alone, contrary to the Opinion of that King, and of all our Kings for many Ages, who have acted with *Lords and Commons* as Co-efficients in the Legislative Ca-

---

\* *Lord Clarendon*, B. 5. p. 511. & 538. & 647. *Old Edit.*  
 pacity;



## 54 The Bishop of BANGOR'S

capacity; and the Power of Parliaments has been exercis'd without Opposition from the Throne, and never was call'd in question by our Princes, tho' of late attack'd with the greatest Insolence by some *Semi-Antiquarians*, &c.

§. 50. Mr. E. Pref. p. 5. tells us King William I. made the Kingdom a perfect Property, &c. 'Tis true, his Reign was full of Violence and Tyranny, of which he repented; but sure this Writer wou'd not have us think his Violations of Law and Property were *de Jure Regio*. As for his Notion, pag. 11. that the Kings of England formerly held all the Lands of England in their own Property, 'tis altogether founded on a mistake, and is never asserted by our Lawyers in the Sense Mr. E. wou'd insinuate. *Fines, Forfeitures* and *Escheats*, or *Devolutions* of Estates having no private Heirs, are by our Antient Laws annex'd to the Crown for Publick Uses, and the Support of the Government, and so become the Property of the Prince, as he is the Representative of the Nation. *Dominia Rerum Singularum ex Jure Gentium descendunt, quod a Principibus non potest tolli. Reges Supremam Potestatem & Jurisdictionem, Dominia vero Rerum Singularum ad subditos spectant. Bene Seneca septimo de Benefic. Omnia Rex imperio possidet, singuli Dominio; ad Imperatores potestas omnium pertinet ad singulos, proprietas.* Dr. Duck, de Author. Jur. Civil. l. 2. c. 1. Which Authorities are so true in Britain, that by *Magna Charta*, and our constant Usage for many Ages, the King here cannot take as his Right one Shilling in the Pound of the Rents of the Nation, but as a Free Gift of the Subject in Parliament.

§. 51. Mr. E. is mightily pleas'd with a Question he puts, Pref. pag. 6. "If, says he, the King is only a Branch of the Supreme Power — are the Lords and Commons the other Branches? If so, let any Man shew me the Supreme Power after the Dissolution of the Houses." Answer. Let him shew it as then in the King

King—The King in *Parliament* acts in his *Legislative Capacity*, i. e. his *Supreme Power* in conjunction with the *Parliament*, out of *Parliament* he acts only in his *Executive Capacity*. Yet his, and his *Parliament's* *Legislative Power* is not extinguish'd, because it ceases to act for a time; but subsists really, virtually, and potentially in the King, Lords and Commons of *Great Britain*.

§. 52. 'Tis strange to observe how carefully Mr. E. defines Hereditary Right, Pref. pag. 12. and affirms hereupon, as all his Friends did, that King *James II.* was *Heres Intestatus* to *Charles II.* and had an Indisputable Right. Yet, pag. 14. Mr. E. asserts expressly, that the *Property of the Crown* is solely in our Kings, and they may appoint whom they please their Heirs. What can be more Inconsistent? King *James II.* had a Right, which, in the Opinion of the old Tories, no Power on Earth cou'd set aside; and yet *Charles II.* might: for Mr. E. says, our Kings may appoint whom they wou'd their Heirs.

§. 53. Some late Writers, indeed, have suppos'd a Power in our Princes to dispose of the Crown by Will, but 'tis a strange Power that was never claim'd or exercis'd without Consent of Parliament: yet Mr. E. infers our Kings have such a Right to dispose of the Crown, from a short Record out of *Rymer's Fœdera*, wherein King *Stephen*, by a writing under his own Hand, appointed *Henry II.* his Successor and Heir after him, &c. and this says Mr. E. King *Stephen* did without the Intervention of Parliament. Very well. I doubt this Record will prove too weak a support for Mr. E's Notions, if it be rightly consider'd. It's plain King *Stephen* was not the Regular Possessor of the Crown, but *Henry* whom he appointed to succeed him: now can any thing be more absurd, than to suppose *Stephen* had a right to dispose of the Crown; who, as an Usurper, had no Right to the Crown? As for *Henry*, he needed not the Authority of *Parliament* to support his Claim; all

56      *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

all he needed was a Declaration of *Stephen's*, that *Henry* was the next Heir. King *Stephen*, indeed, uses these Words, *Constitui, & Ei, & Hæredibus suis Regnum Anglia confirmavi*, to gratify his own Pride; but *Henry* look'd upon 'em as giving him no Title: that Title he did (and I dare say Mr. *E.* will) found upon his Descent from *Henry I.* Here's a *Record* then, produc'd by Mr. *E.* to shew the sole Property of the Kingdom was in our Kings, because an Usurper tells the Legal Heir that he shall succeed him. *Risum teneatis*——Wou'd our Jacobites have acquiesc'd, if Queen *Anne* had under hand, or by her Will, without the concurrence of *Parliament*, confirm'd the Succession to the Princess *Sophia*, (as she did by many Acts and Deeds in and out of *Parliament*) in the same Words as King *Stephen* did? Yet the Property of the Kingdom being solely in our Kings, as Mr. *E.* holds, the Queen might, according to Mr. *E.*'s Notion, Pref. pag. 14. appoint whom she pleas'd Heir thereto. This, I confess, might be us'd as a new Argument for his Majesty not thought on hitherto by his Friends; but, I thank God, he does not stand in need of such broken Reeds.

§. 54. This Mr. *E.* is not very lucky in meddling with Records; for to “shew the Legislative Power of the Lords and Commons not to be so Antient as some pretend, &c.” he mentions a Letter of *Henry II.* quitting his Claim to Wrecks, &c. If the King had a just Claim to such Wrecks by the Common Law, who doubts but he might quit and renounce it without a Parliament? If our Kings make Grants of Lands or Privileges to a Subject out of Parliament, which is common in every Reign; must it presently be suppos'd they held no *Parliaments*?

§. 55. Another proof out of Mr. *Rymer's Fœdera*, which indeed is no proof, yet offer'd by Mr. *E.* to maintain his Notion, that our Kings have solely without *Lords or Commons* exercis'd a Legislative Power; is an Ordinance, as he calls it, of *Richard I.*

con.



concerning *Pilgrims, &c.* surely Mr. E. did not heed the *Stile* of it. Had he minded those Words *de Communi Proborum Virorum Consilio*, and read Mr. Tyrrel's *Bibliotheca*, he wou'd have dropt this Record, as being clearly against his Assertion; but a warm Head can fetch Conclusions from any Premises. King Richard's Exactions upon the Clergy, and others, shall be an Argument of Right, pag. 17. which Mr. E. himself in the very next Page shews, by a Statute of King Richard, "was a Wrong that he "promis'd neither he nor his Successors shou'd put in "practice again, upon any pretence whatsoever; but that "all the Liberties of the Church shou'd be inviolably "preserv'd." Plainly implying that those Liberties had been violated by King Richard.

§. 56. From the word Clergy, Mr. E. takes occasion to start a new game, pag. 18, 19. shewing what humble Application was made by our Princes formerly to the Monks and Secular Clergy; and that King John did not so much as pretend to write to the Bishops of his time in a Mandatory *Stile*—but desir'd them to intercede with the Pope in his behalf. Blessed Times indeed! What wou'd Mr. E. be at? From Facts of Violence and Arrogance infer the Rights of Princes and Clergy? Wou'd he have these things reviv'd? Are the Violences of some of our Kings, and the Arrogance of the Popish Clergy in former Ages, the Old Constitution he likes and vindicates? 'Tis plain our Nonjurors are hard set, when they are forc'd to defend their Cause by the Facts of a Popish Clergy, and Tyrannical Princes. Mr. E. shou'd not have to go to the Story of Thomas Becket and the Whipping Monks of Canterbury, to shew the Rights of the Clergy in Henry II's Reign; but the Gentleman tells us, pag. 20. 'Tis time to draw in his Reins, Passion indulg'd may speak extravagant Truths—His Insinuation of Severity is monstrous Falshood and Ingratitude, when thousands of the late Rebels are alive and in good heart, ready for a new Trial of Skill at *Dumblain*,

## 58 The Bishop of BANGOR's

if their *Foreign Helps* don't fail 'em: Which hitherto, thanks to a kind Providence, have done us no hurt, but have done the *Nonjurors* this real Service, viz. to put them upon seriously considering with themselves, *What they have been doing! What Cause they have been writing and fighting for! What Plots they have form'd against our Religion and Country! What Innocent Blood they have spilt, and wou'd still be glad to spill! How much Blood and Treasure their wicked Notions have cost this Nation! How much they have encourag'd Popery! How many of their Friends are apostatiz'd to Popery! What Ruin their Notions have caus'd, and what Calamities and Universal Desolation must follow, if their Immoral and Impious Prayers were heard!* These will be proper Subjects for Meditation, after Mr. E. has impartially review'd his own Papers, and the *Preservative*, without Prejudice. We are not startled with his Confidence, nor baffled with empty Sounds: His Mistakes are palpable, and so are his Hatred and Animosity.

S. 57. We can read the Recognition *Primo Jacobi*, (which Mr. E. recites) without fear for our Cause; \* tho the *Nonjurors* cannot examine our Histories, or our Laws, without blushing: For they wou'd find our wise Ancestors (from *Fergus I.* to *Kenneth III.* which was 1300 Years) dispos'd of the Succession to the fittest of the *Royal Line*, without regard to a direct Descent. They wou'd find *John Baliol*, the Ninety sixth King of Scotland, and his Posterity excluded, and the Crown settled upon *Robert Bruce* and his Posterity: They wou'd find, of that very *Robert Bruce's* Descendants by a Female, thirteen of the *Stuarts* have reign'd in Scotland, whose Original Title was founded upon Acts of Ex-

---

\* No body can reasonably doubt, but the ordinary Course of Succession should always take place, when 'tis for the Publick Good; and 'tis as reasonable it shou'd always give place, when that is necessary for the Publick Safety.

*clusion and Settlement.* And yet what a *Din* is made by this *Gentleman*, and others, for a *Pretender*, who if he were really the Son of King *James*, must not, cannot deny, nor all his Friends for him, that the *Brunswick Stuart*, now on the Throne, has just the same Title, as the thirteen *Bruce Stuarts* who last possess'd it: but with this great Advantage, that this *Protestant Stuart* is most capable and qualify'd to govern, that is, to execute all our *Protestant Laws and Statutes in Defence of our Protestant Religion and Liberties*; but a *Popish Stuart* is not, and cannot be, whilst a *Papist*.

§. 58. Let Mr. *E.* remove this Difficulty, and that will do more Service to his Cause than one hundred of his Tracts in the Mathematical way; which no body yet has been idle enough to answer, and therefore 'tis not answer'd: and he may depend upon it, no body will return him a particular Answer to all his Mistakes in his *Old English Constitution*. It wou'd, indeed, be transcribing most of the Book, when to read it only is a Task ungrateful to such who can better employ their time.

§. 59. Mr. *E.* begins his Discourse with an Account of his former Performance, and some new Remarks which are far from being clear or methodical: 'Tis a *Farrago* of several things that may, and may not be granted; for which few will thank him, because few will understand him. Had this Gentleman read without byass the *Judicious Mr. Hooker*, *Grotius* and *Puffendorf*, or Mr. *Lock* of Government, and consider'd 'em impartially; all his Pains had been sav'd, and his unhappy Prejudices avoided, which have tainted his Charity to that degree, that he is not afraid, pag. 11. to affix the most extravagant Imputation upon a whole Body, who scorn however to retaliate, and wish him a better Spirit. Some Mens Wit and Writings do most hurt to themselves, which I believe will be the Fate of Mr. *E.* I cannot but pity him much, when I consider what



a Labyrinth the whole Discourse is. However, there is such an Appearance \* of Sincerity in this Gentleman, that I can freely allow him no small share in my Charity, as I dare say the Bishop of Bangor does, notwithstanding his ill Treatment.

§. 60. Mr. E. pag. 26, 27. gives us his Sense of Rom. 13. and says, "The Interpretation of these 4 Words [the Powers that be] by some is Ridiculous; "for they wou'd persuade the World, that the Precept extends to give a Sanction to any Usurping Powers "in their own Times." Those whom Mr. E. calls Whigs have said, and will say that such an Interpretation is Impious, for 'tis to make God the Author of Evil. Yet this very Gentleman a few Lines after says, "That no Power can be constituted but by God; "and by such Authority the Roman Emperors reign'd." Whom all Histories condemn for the greatest Usurpers, Tyrants, and Enemies to Authority, or Just Civil Power, that ever liv'd. And thus Mr. E. has extended the Words to give a Sanction, as he speaks, to Usurping Powers, &c. And 'tis to the same purpose this Text is generally apply'd by the Jacobite Writers, who make Tyrants the Ordinance of God, and say they are not to be resisted. This Absurdity is in Words disclaim'd by Mr. E. I wish he and his Friends did not run into it in certain Cases. Those he calls Whigs, will to a Man reject with Abhorrence the thought of a Divine Right either in Usurpers or Tyrants. Civil Power or Authority, truly so call'd, is always to be submitted to; but Tyranny and Usurpation are to be borne by Nations, till fairly redress'd in a just and reasonable, and if it may be, in a National way.

---

\* This was written before I saw his Serious Admonition to the Reverend Dr. Kennet, in which there are so many absurd, insolent, and unchristian things; that it has much abated the Compassion I had for the Author, who seems to have renounc'd the common Rules of Charity and Good Manners.

§. 61. Mr. E. is mightily against Providential Kings, p. 29. "*Providential Plagues and Famines he thinks may be as well pleaded for, as Providential Usurpers.*" Without doubt Tyrants and Usurpers are sometimes the Instruments of Providence, like Plagues and Famines, to execute Divine Justice upon a sinful People, who nevertheless are seldom left without Remedy. The Oppression of the *Israhites* in Egypt, and of their Posterity by several of the neighbouring Nations, and from their own Kings too, were permitted by God for their Sins: But then his Providence rais'd up *Moses*, and several of the Judges, to be the *Deliverers* of his People. Whatever Mr. E. may think, in God's account *one providential King*, who rescues an *Oppress'd Nation* from *Tyranny* and *Despotick Violence*, has more of God's Favour for so *Glorious and Divine an Enterprize*, than a thousand *Hereditary Tyrants*. Doing the least Good has ever God's Approbation, who is the great Legislator, and the righteous Judge: The greatest Good then cannot but be most agreeable to his Will, and his Authority in the Government of the World; and therefore most certainly consonant to the Rules of Equity and Justice found in the Holy Scriptures, or discoverable by the Light of Nature. From which Consideration it may be most truly affirm'd, that the *Glorious Deliverers* of *Oppress'd Nations* act in that Work most certainly by a *Divine Right*; whereas *Usurpers* and *Tyrants*, as such, have not the least claim to a *Divine* or *Human Right*: in which I greatly differ from Mr. E. pag. 30. who is setting up what just before he had pull'd down, and makes a settled Usurpation of the *Casars* the Ordinance of God. By this new Inconsistency, if *Richard*, or his Son, had fix'd *Oliver's* Usurpation, it must at last have been God's Ordinance! Monstrous Absurdity!

§. 62. After Mr. E. had given us his Sense of *Romans* 13. which is not of that moment to be con-

62 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

consider'd, he begins to name his *Corollaries*; 1st, *That no Government can be alter'd or subverted but by a Divine Command.* He seems by Government to mean the Form of Government. By what Divine Command does this Gentleman think, that the several Independent *Monarchies* in this *Island*, which before King *Egbert* were about twelve, in *England*, *Scotland* and *Wales*, were reduced after some Ages under one Head? We know this happen'd, partly by Conquest and partly by Marriage; but 'tis trifling to pursue this Gentleman's Singularities. He might have sav'd himself the Trouble and Vanity of Citations from the *Fathers* about Obedience to Government. Every reasonable Man is satisfy'd in that, except his Friends, who appear'd at *Preston* and *Dumblain*; and his Declamations against *Rebellion* wou'd not be unseasonable, if discreetly address'd to the late *Rebels* and their *Abettors*: But as they are manag'd, can do us no Service, nor bring the Author any Credit, who has several daring Innuendo's and new Notions about our *Constitution*, which will surprize, but not convince his Readers, nor survive himself. Never any Gentleman before him, I dare say, had the like Notion of our Constitution, and 'tis likely no body that comes after him will have the same. Whoever has dipp'd into our Laws and Histories, smile at his Performance, as our *Divines* do at the reading his Exposition of *Romans 13*. The best Excuse for such a Rhapsody, is his Party-Zeal, which itself needs an Excuse. The Gentleman has made a cursory search after Authorities, and set down every thing that fell in his way without Examination. When he gives himself time to consider, he has Parts enough to discover his own Mistakes, and I wish he may do himself the Honour to forsake 'em.

§. 63. Give me leave, my Lord, briefly to represent a few more of his Oversights in his Reflection upon the Bishop of *Bangor*. In pag. 76. Mr. E. says,



says, *The Bishop challenges any Man to prove, that God ever instituted any particular Form of Human Government for any Nation, but one; yet he, in the next Line or two, says, According to the Bishop's Scheme, God in the Holy Scriptures never instituted any Form of Government.*

§. 64. In pag. 78. Mr. E. very fairly infers, from the Bishop's saying, *That God had instituted no Form of Human Government, &c. that therefore God had appointed no Government at all: and then Mr. E. falls into his Jacobite Fits, &c. which have a great appearance of Lunacy and Idiocy while they last; for they make him forgetful of the Bishop's Character and his own, and hurry him into indecent Insinuations: which I pass, and will only tell him, that it wou'd be well for Mr. E's Friends, if they had minded better their Oaths, Declarations and Subscriptions too; or cou'd find a way to reconcile with them their Denial of the King's Supremacy, their new Notions of Priestly Powers, their absurd Notions of unlimited Obedience to Princes, without Law, and against Law, and against the real Authority of those Princes founded in Law: Their Gross and Antiscriptural Notions of the Trinity, and Divinity of our Blessed Saviour: Their continual Cant of the Church, the Church; especially when they have started any new, false or ridiculous Doctrines, or have ready any Plot against the Government.*

§. 65. Mr. E. is much offended with the Bishop for mentioning King James II's Incapacity for our Protestant Government; and he says, that he is sorry to find in the Bishop's Book, pag. 25. *That King James commenc'd a Lunatick or an Idiot, &c.* This is citing the Bishop's Words as a Jesuit wou'd do. Does not Mr. E. know, that no such Words are to be found in that Page, or in any part of the Bishop's Book? Nay, does not the Bishop say in that very Page expressly, that "*King James's Natural Temper, and his Moral Accomplishments were no worse than those of many other Princes, and that it was his Religion*"  
"only

## 64 The Bishop of BANGOR.

"only that made him incapable?" How durst Mr. E. then in defiance to his own Eyes and his own Conscience say, that he is sorry to find in the *Bishop's Book*, pag. 25. That King James commenc'd a Lunatick, or an Idiot, &c. when he found no such Words, but quite contrary Expressions? Yet Mr. E. falls puts those Words upon the *Bishop*, and then assaults him, without Mercy or Civility, in the 84th Page, where Mr. E. takes upon him to draw Consequences from the *Bishop's* Words, to render him odious and ridiculous: Which puts me in mind of the like barbarous Practice of the Popish Writers in James II's Reign, when they durst not, and cou'd not undertake to answer like Scholars and Gentlemen the Discourses of our Divines; they presently betook themselves to this Stratagem, of amusing the People, by telling 'em the absurd or wicked Consequences of this and that eminent Clergyman's Doctrines. Just thus the Bishop is us'd by the candid Mr. E. in several Instances, which Mr. E. must blush to review, if he thinks any Justice due to an Adversary.

§ 66. Mr. E. pag. 86. charges the *Bishop* with a manifest Falshood; and says, "He was astonish'd to find that the word *Spirituality* is by the *Bishop* said to be in the Form of Homage done by Bishops to the King." How bold a Charge is this? How wou'd this Gentleman be offended, if a Charge of Ignorance and Insolence were retorted? Either Mr. E. has not seen the Form, or he has, as he wou'd insinuate. If he has not, how durst he charge the *Bishop* with Falshood right or wrong? If he has seen the Form, how astonishing must his Confidence be, to say, the *Temporalities* are expressly mention'd without the *Spiritualities*? Poor Gentleman! He was frighted with the Sound of the Word: when 'tis well known that *Spiritualities*, in the Form of Homage, don't signify the Powers that are purely Ecclesiastical, receiv'd in Consecration; but means only the Profits he

he receives as a *Bishop*, and not as a Baron of Parliament. Stawford's *Pleas of the Crown*, p. 132.

§. 67. Mr. E. is intoxicated with a new Notion of the *Nonjurors*; that the Relation between a *Bishop* and his *Diocese*, being of a *Spiritual Nature*, is not to be dissolv'd by the *Civil Magistrate*. According to which Doctrine, the *Popish Bishops* who were disabled by an Act 1 *Eliz.* (and some hundreds of *Divines* who were depriv'd by the Act of Uniformity 1662) continu'd notwithstanding the *Rightful Pastors*, and were not regularly depriv'd; and the *Protestant Bishops* who succeeded were *Intruders*! Whither are these Men driving? \*

§. 68. This Gentleman wilfully runs into the same Mis-representation of the *Bishop*, as the rest, who have written against the *Bishop*. In p. 40. and afterwards for several Pages together, the *Bishop* plainly says, "The Lay-Power does not concern itself with the Powers or Capacities within; but only takes care they shall not be exerted to the hazard of the Publick, and deprives Ecclesiasticks of the Exercise of their Office or Function, to the Prejudice of the State, &c." This is the constant Stile of the *Bishop* every where; yet, to make the *Bishop* odious, this Gentleman represents him as maintaining, that *Bishops* may be depriv'd by *Lay-Powers* of their *Spiritual*, and *Episcopal Powers*, and *Ecclesiastical Character*; which every Reader may presently see is a

---

\* My Lord Coke expressly tells us, *Instit.* 1 Part. §. 648. That at first all the *Bishopricks* of England were founded by our Kings, and were Donative, till the 9th of King John. And the Founders and Patrons of Churches or Chappels admitted Clerks, without the Intervention of the Ordinary, to give Admission and Institution. This was the first beginning of that pretended indissoluble Relation by Civil Power. It must be remembred also, that such Founders had a right to visit, and not the Ordinary, and consequently had a right to deprive, if they found their terms of Admission violated. *Hugh's Parson's Law*, Cap. I.



## 66 The Bishop of BANGOR's

notorious Imposition upon himself and the Bishop too.

§. 69. The Case of *Abiathar* is so fully, clearly, and unanswerably stated by the Bishop, as far as an Instance of Deprivation in the Jewish Government can extend to a parallel case in the *British* Government, that the Bishop's Answerers are put to hard shifts to elude the force of it, and to impose upon their Readers. The Text says expressly, that King *Solomon*, 1 Kings 2. 25, 26, and 35. thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord—and *Zadok* the Priest did the King put in the room of *Abiathar*. *Grotius* in *Loc.* says *Solomon* did this *Jure Regio*. *Varablus*, says, *Privavit eum Sacerdotali Dignitate*. But *Estius*, *Corn.* a *Lapide*, and the *Popish* Commentators, will have *Abiathar's* Deprivation to be only indirecte, & ex consequenti; that is, the Consequence of his Banishment from *Jerusalem*, where only the High Priest's Office cou'd be executed: and this last is the Sense of the *Nonjurors*. We won't quarrel about Niceties, Mr. E's Sense shall be admitted, viz. that King *Solomon* only banish'd *Abiathar*. It must follow then, that he hinder'd, and totally disabled him from executing the *High Priest's* Office, which is all the Bishop contends for; and by putting *Zadok* in *Abiathar's* room, it will also follow, that there was a Vacancy, and the *Spiritual* Relation between *Abiathar* and the *Jewish Church* was extinguish'd by mere *Exile*; for the *Nonjurors* will not allow it was done by Royal Authority. If therefore King *George* wou'd oblige hereafter our *Nonjurors*, he must not take upon him to deprive 'em by Acts of Parliament, but only banish 'em out of the Nation, which is a proper *Civil Punishment* they admit the *Lay Power* may exercise. And this was exercis'd by *Arcadius* the Emperor, who banish'd *St. Chrysostom* for the Liberty he took of reflecting upon the Empress *Eudoxia* in his Sermons. What does Mr. E. think had been his Punishment, if

if *Chrysostom* had declar'd against *Arcadius* for another Emperor?

Mr. E's Readers must smile at his pretended Triumph over the Bishop, pag. 91. because the Bishop allows a *Heathen Emperor the Right of Self-Defence against a Bishop who is his Enemy*; and yet maintains the Incapacity of a *Popish Prince to govern this Protestant Realm*. From hence Mr. E. insults with this Conclusion, *That Popery, upon the Bishop's Principles, is a greater Incapacity than Paganism*: Which, however strange this may appear to Mr. E. and his Friends, who have lately a great Tenderness for *Popery*; yet 'tis found by sad Experience to be too true in *Hungary, Transylvania, and other Countries*, where *Popish and Mahometan Princes* have by turns been their Masters by the Fate of War. The *Protestants* who have made the Trial, and other Christians, prefer the *Mahometan* to the *Popish Yoke*, as lighter of the two. And if our *Jacobites* were to make a trial, they wou'd find it so, unless they have lately made some further secret Steps towards a Coalition with the *Church of Rome*.

§. 70. One wou'd think by the Air and Stile of several Passages in his Book, Mr. E. had been actually reconcil'd. There's so much Fierceness and Ill-breeding in most of the Paragraphs towards the end of the Pamphlet, that it may be well suspected to have been publish'd, *Permissu Superiorum*. He seems to have learn'd *Lesley's Art of playing the Trickster and Buffoon in Controversy*, and to write for the Mob. Absurd Inferences are drawn from the *Bishop's Words*, and false Comments put upon 'em; and then the Bishop is insulted without Mercy or Good Manners: as every Reader may see, especially from the 88th Page to the end of the Book. If young *Oliver at Urbino* has no better *Advocates*, than those who have appear'd for him against the Bishop of *Bangor*, his Cause, God be prais'd, is grown desperate, and its *Defenders contemptible*. Now Mr. *Lesley* is turn'd

## 68      *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

*Knight Errant*, his *Deputy Controvertists* expose themselves, and their Cause, by the weakest and rudest Pamphlets that have been penn'd, since the Days of King *James II.* when the Priests and Jesuits, who cou'd hardly write true *English*, pretended to banter our Learned Divines, just as these *Answerers do the Bishop of Bangor.* When Father *Lesley* comes to hear how these *Triflers* have manag'd in his Absence, he'll silence the whole Set, and issue out new Commissions to Father *Milburn*, Father *Welton*, &c.

§. 71. The last Hand, that is lifted up against the Bishop of *Bangor*, is Mr. *H---gs*, who calls his Papers, *A modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative*, &c. and yet very immodestly tells the World in the Title Page, that he has prov'd *some Principles advanc'd by the Bishop of Bangor seem destructive of all Reveal'd Religion.* This is a high Charge against a *Christian Bishop*, and ought to be grounded upon Proofs very clear and strong, especially when offer'd by a private Member of our Church, against a Prelate of his own Communion. I hint this to Mr. *H---gs*, because he seems to be a Person, whom Religion has made Serious and Inquisitive. He must know, that 'tis not for his own Reputation to make so bold an Attack upon a *Bishop*, even tho his Proofs were probable. What then will the World judge of Mr. *H---gs*, when upon reading they shall find *Parturiunt Montes, nascetur Ridiculus Mus*; That Mr. *H---gs* was only frightened, and thought there was a dangerous Tendency in a Passage or two of the Bishop's *Preservative*, and therefore resolv'd not to spare 'em?

§. 72. This Gentleman proposes, p. 3. to consider two Points in the *Preservative*, that of our Saviour's forgiving Sins, and the Case of *Abiathar*. The Sense in which our Saviour forgave Sins is represented by the Bishop in one entire Paragraph, p. 94. and in my poor Opinion, with the utmost exactness, with  
rela-



relation to God, to our Saviour, and the Nature of Forgiveness it self. The Reader is desir'd carefully to weigh the Bishop's Words, and then consider Mr. H---g's Remarks, which are not a little foreign and surprizing. He does not point out one single Sentence of the Bishop's, wherein he places any Mistake; but sets himself a task to prove, that Christ forgave Sins by his own original and underiv'd Power. Now, tho this does not any ways concern the Preservative, yet this Gentleman is very fond of proving it. The first Proof is this, "Christ purchas'd us by his Blood, and therefore he had an Original Power to forgive Sins. Which is in other words, Christ acquir'd this Power, and therefore 'tis Original. What he purchas'd, he had not before; and if he cou'd not forgive Sins before that Purchase, he certainly cou'd not forgive 'em originally. So this Argument is φάρμακον Ἀυτοφόνου—

§. 73. His next Argument is, "Christ is Self-Existent, and therefore had an original and underiv'd Power to forgive Sins. To prove his Antecedent, he refers us to the Articles, but names no Words, nor Clause in 'em. All the Ancient Creeds we have adopted into our Liturgy speak of Christ, as a begotten Son; now is that a Self-Existent Son? The Son is said to be of (ἀπὸ, that is, from) the Father; and is that Self-Existent? The Father is of, or from none, is not that Self-Existent? So the Creed, commonly call'd Athanasian; and so the four Evangelists, and the whole New Testament, and all Orthodox and Heterodox Antiquity too.

§. 74. Mr. H---g's next Step is to produce several Texts in favour of Christ's Purchase and Self-Existence; which, some of 'em at least, were never press'd into the Service before. The Reader will blush for him; and think, as I do, it was great pity this Gentleman shou'd not know himself, or be better advis'd. Alas for him, the World will not bear his proving *Quidlibet ex quolibet*. His 5th, 6th and

## 70 *The Bishop of BANGOR'S*

and 7th Pages are written in the way of *Jacob Behmen*, or *Mr. Sikes*, and are really *past all Human Understanding*. What Mortal wou'd expect, that is acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, an Application so foreign, so inept, from a Man of Letters!

§. 75. The next thing this Gentleman undertakes is the Case of *Abiathar*; upon which he endeavours to shew,

1. That *Abiathar* was not High Priest.
2. That he was not depos'd by *Solomon*.
3. That the Kings of *Judah* had no Ecclesiastical Supremacy.

For the first Point, *That Abiathar was not High Priest*; 'tis a Notion contrary to the Judgment of the best *Commentators*, who from 2 *Sam.* 8. 15. and Ch. 15. 29---35. and Ch. 19. 11. and from other places say; the High Priesthood was jointly in *Zadok* and *Abiathar* for some time; and perhaps exercis'd alternately, as the Functions of the Priests were by the Posterity of *Eleazar* and *Ithamar*, 1 *Chron.* 24. from whom *Zadok* and *Abiathar* descended. 2. 'Tis evident, that *Abiathar* executed the Function of High Priest alone for some time, otherwise *Zadok* cou'd not be said to be put in his room, 1 *Kings* 2. 35. for *Zadok* was without dispute *High Priest*; and what cou'd he be appointed to execute in the room of *Abiathar*, but the High Priest's Office? 3. Upon a compare of two Texts which *Mr. H---gs* desires to have read and compar'd, viz. 2 *Sam.* 20. 25. and 1 *Kings* 4. 4. I say, 'tis plain from these Texts, that the principal *Military, Civil* and *Ecclesiastical Officers* in *David's* and *Solomon's* Courts are there recited, and in both Texts *Abiathar* is nam'd with *Zadok*. 4. *Menochius* has demonstrated from *Josephus*, as well as from other Considerations, that *Abiathar* was *High Priest*. And *Grotius* says expressly, that the *High Priests*, pointing at the Case of *Zadok* and *Abiathar*, were appointed or depos'd by the *Kings* of *Israel*. 5. Supposing, but not granting, that *Abiathar*

thar was not High Priest ; yet, as *Vatablus* words it, *Solomon privavit eum dignitate Sacerdotali* ; or, *Dejecit ab executione Officii*, as most agree : and that is enough for an Instance of the Deprivation of a Priest by the Civil Power, which is the point the Bishop of *Bangor* had in his view. But to return, Mr. *H---gs* indeed roundly affirms, p. 11. that *Abiathar* cou'd not be *High Priest* till the Extinction of *Eleazar's* Line. This, if true, must be because the High Priesthood was by God's appointment confin'd to Seniority and Proximity of Blood ; but I don't find any such Order in the *Levitical Law* \*. Besides 'tis look'd upon as certain, by Learned Men, that from *Uzzi* to *Zadok*, the four intermediate Persons in fact were not *High Priests*. *Eli* was not of the Line of *Eleazar*, and is not found in his Genealogy, 1 *Chron.* 6. But *Josephus*, *Lib. Antiq.* 5. makes *Eli* a Descendant of *Ishamar*, *Aaron's* younger Son ; and so it appears that he was, by comparing 1 *Sam.* 4. 11. chap. 14. 3. chap. 22. 20. with 1 *Chron.* 24. 3. in which last Text *Abimelech* is said to be of the Sons of *Ishamar*. And the same *Abimelech* by the foregoing Texts appears to be the Great Grandson of *Eli*.

§. 76. The next thing Mr. *H---gs* undertakes, is to shew, that “ *Abiathar* never was depos'd by Solomon, p. 12, 13.” The rest of the Gentlemen who have pretended to answer the Bishop, have not, in this particular, so openly attack'd that plain Account of a matter of fact, 1 *Kings* 2. 27. as this Gentleman does. They chose the way of the *Popish Commentators*, to evade the force of the Text, by saying, that *Solomon* depriv'd, or depos'd, or excluded *Abiathar*, *indirecté*, & *ex consequenti*, &c. and not *de jure* & *Autoritate propria*, &c. but this Gentleman cites

---

\* The Separation of *Aaron* and his Sons, all without Distinction, is appointed, *Exod.* 28. and 29th Chap. and the Perpetuity of the Priesthood was promis'd to *Aaron's* Sons in general, *ibid.*



## 72 The Bishop of BANGOR's

these Words, [*Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord, \**] and presently takes upon him to shew, that he was not thrust out by Solomon. This is a little shocking, to deny in express terms what the Scriptures affirm in a matter of fact. What are Mr. H--gs Reasons? Why, he cites a Prophecy concerning Eli's Posterity, mention'd 1 Sam. 2. 31. — *ad fin.* "Which shews, that his Posterity (of which Abiathar was one) shou'd be excluded from the Priesthood, and shou'd intreat to be put in the Priest's Office, &c." Now this, Interpreters refer to Abiathar, who was excluded. But Mr. H--gs, with wonderful Sagacity, brings this Prophecy, which foretold Abiathar should be excluded, to prove that he was not excluded. And if he was not, it does not appear that any other of Eli's Posterity were excluded; but the Reader will observe, that the whole Passage, 1 Sam. 2. 31. *ad fin.* is a Denunciation against Eli's Family and Posterity, part of which was fulfill'd by Hophni and Phineas, and Ahimelech's being slain; but the compleat fulfilling of that Prophecy, by the Exclusion of Abiathar from being Priest, is directly apply'd in that very particular, 1 Kings 2. 27. to the foremention'd Prophecy. So then here's a very plain case directly contradicting Mr. H--gs's Notion, that Abiathar was not excluded from the Priesthood. Eli was told of the Fate of his Family, because of theirs, and his Sins; that some shou'd be cut off, &c. and others excluded, &c. and when Abiathar's Exclusion was mention'd, 'tis presently said to be a fulfilling of that Prophecy.

§. 77. My Lord, my Readers will wonder how Mr. H--gs evades so plain a Passage, for he does but evade it. Why first, he says, p. 13. we find Abia-

---

\* The Learned Bishop Jewel thus expresses his Sense of the matter; Abiatharus Episcopum summovit, & in ejus locum Zadocum surrogavit. Apol. p. 162. 12mo Edit.

thar, 1 Chron. 4. 1—4. as he was in David's time, "next to Zadok, over all the Courses of Priests, &c." But does that Text say so much? Nothing like it. The Names of Zadok and Abiathar are mention'd indeed (as they are 2 Sam. 20. 25.) but so are the Names of the other principal Officers, that acted under Solomon during his Reign. Abiathar having been High Priest, or executing the High Priest's Office at the beginning of Solomon's Reign, his Name might well be inserted in the List, which the Author of *Chronicles* makes of Solomon's chief Ecclesiastical and Civil Officers. Abiathar, solo nomine Sacerdos, ut vacantes in Imperio, &c. as Grotius. I believe Mr. H---gs is the first, and 'tis likely, will be the last who will suppose Abiathar was still executing the Priests Office in contradiction to a plain Text, 1 Kings 2. 27. which says, *he was thrust out from being Priest*; and Mr. H---gs ventures to suppose this, only because Abiathar happens to be mention'd in a List of the Chiefs who had acted under Solomon during his Reign.

§. 78. Mr. H---gs's next reason why Abiathar was not depos'd by Solomon, was perhaps never mentioned, nor never thought on by any body but himself. All the *Learned Versions*, and *Commentators*, are against him in his new Notion. He says, p. 14. that שָׁמַר shou'd be render'd, "Solomon wou'd have thrust him out, &c." Immanuel Tremellius, the Learned Junius, Castalio, the Vulgar, the Seventy, and, I believe, all the Antient Versions, and those in Modern Languages that I have seen, agree with our Translation exactly, and are full against Mr. H---gs's Version. The Version of the Seventy is of very great Authority with all Learned Men, and that is as express as any of the rest: and what confirms our Translation, and the Sense wherein every body has understood this Text till now, is this; that in the 35th ver. of the same 1 Kings 2.

'tis plainly said, that *Solomon* put *Zadok* in the room of *Abiathar*; which cou'd not have been done, if *Solomon* only wou'd have thrust out *Abiathar*, as Mr. *H---gs* wou'd have it; and *Abiathar* had not been actually thrust out, depos'd, or depriv'd. Besides, 'tis observable, that immediately before, in the beginning of the said 35th ver. 'tis said, that *Solomon* put *Benaiah* in the room of *Joab* over the Host; and then 'tis added, that he put *Zadok* in the room of *Abiathar*. Whence 'tis evident beyond all Contradiction, that *Zadok* succeeded in the room and stead of *Abiathar*, as *Benaiah* did in the room and stead of *Joab*: A new General, and High Priest, in place of the old ones. And as for Mr. *H---gs* his Criticism upon the Hebrew Verb, which is a future in *Pihel* of the Preter Signification, I don't find any ground for it in the Grammar of that Language, or any peculiar Idiom in that word to justify his Supposition, but the contrary. How vain and ostentatious this Attempt to alter the Version appears in Mr. *H---gs*, I leave others to judge.

§. 79. And now, my Lord, we are come to Mr. *H---gs*'s third Assertion; and that is, that the Kings of *Judah* had no Supremacy of their Priests, p. 15. What then? Suppose that to be so. Had not the Kings of *Israel*? Yes, Mr. *H---gs* says, "They had an absolute Supremacy." Very well, that's as much granted as can be desir'd. For *Solomon* was King of the twelve Tribes: So according to Mr. *H---gs*, he then had an Absolute Supremacy, and might therefore, if he pleas'd, deprive *Abiathar*, or any of the Priests, not only upon a Civil, but also upon an Ecclesiastical Account, if Mr. *H---gs* be right in saying he had an Absolute Supremacy; but that, at present, is not worth Enquiry. Tho I cannot but observe without pity, that Mr. *H---gs* very accurately informs his Readers what was the Foundation of this Absolute Supremacy,



macy, in these words—*It was founded upon this*, says he, that the Kings of *Israel* made the Priesthood and Religion ever which they were so Supreme. I leave this to be understood by others, for my part I can only admire, and wonder the Gentleman had no Friends to keep him from exposing—but I forbear, tho I must tell him, the very next Paragraph one wou'd think was written in *Be—m.* No wonder then, that he goes on to give himself such Airs, and to conclude with abundance of Satisfaction in himself.

§. 80. He goes on, p. 19. to except against the Bishop for saying, Solomon claim'd a Right over the Life of Abiathar. I don't find it worded so by the Bishop. However, no body can well doubt but so much is imply'd in Solomon's words, "*Thou art worthy of Death, but I will not at present put thee to death.*" Because of the Duty and Affection he had shown to his Father *David*, that alone mov'd his Compassion, and suspended the Execution of *Abiathar*, and the depriving him of his Income at *Anatboth*; which being a Freehold for Life only, and a Personal Interest, must have follow'd the Fate of its Possessor; it being in the King's power to have held, or receiv'd *Abiathar's* Income during his Life, which was the longest Term a Priest could be Master of. As for the Allotment of forty eight Cities and their Territories out of the twelve Tribes, for the Maintenance of the Priests by Divine Appointment, there was nothing singular in that, forasmuch as the whole Country was by the same Divine Appointment allotted to the twelve Tribes, *Josh. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.* So that if such Appointment render'd the Title of the present Possessor indefeizable, then there cou'd be no Forfeiture of any other Man's Title that was not of the Sons of *Aaron*.

§. 81. My Lord, Mr. H---gs had a mind to make his Paper remarkable, by pretending to shew, that *some Principles advanced by the Bishop of Bangor are destructive of all Reveal'd Religion*. This bold Suggestion he takes care to make the very first Article in his Title-Page. How this becomes the Title of his Paper, which is call'd, *A Modest Enquiry*, I leave others to judge; and desire he wou'd well consider, especially at this *Season of Humiliation*. Surely a modest Man wou'd have been far from treating thus a *Bishop* of his own Communion, unless the grounds he went upon were clear and undeniable. In this modest manner our Bishops and Divines were attack'd in *James II's* Reign by the *modest Priests and Jesuits*, who writ to the *Mob*; lustily affirming, and stoutly denying whatever was for their purpose. They thought to carry all by Bluster and Noise. Had Mr. E---ry, or Mr. H---gs, or any of the Bishop's Answerers, been the Disciples of *Loyola*, they cou'd not have treated a *Protestant Bishop* in harder Terms, or with more groundless Clamour and stupid Reflections. If a Man had not a great mind to cavil, wou'd such a Passage as Mr. H---gs refers to in the 78th Page of the *Bishop's Preservative*, be made the ground of so terrible an Accusation, as that *the Bishop's Principles seem destructive of all Reveal'd Religion*? To give colour to this Charge, Mr. H---gs is oblig'd to be very obscure, and unsearchable in his Arguments. Had I a mind to divert my Readers, I might come upon him directly, and prove that Mr. H---gs's Notions overthrow the whole Design of the *New Testament*, and the express Doctrine of all the *Antient Creeds*; who all affirm, in every place, that *Jesus Christ was the Son of God, sent of God, receiv'd Power from God, was God of God, begotten of God, &c.* whereas Mr. H---gs, in contradiction to all these, affirms, *Christ is a Self-existent Being*.  
Again,

Again, how easy is it to charge Mr. H---gs with sapping the Foundation of the Christian Religion, by his deriving, p. 25, 26. the great Evidence of the Christian Religion from a *Regular uninterrupted Succession of Persons qualify'd and regularly Ordain'd?* &c. For this is his Chain of Evidences—"The Evidence of the Christian Religion were miraculous Facts—the Sacraments are the Memorials of those Facts, and a Regular uninterrupted Succession only, &c. can preserve those Memorials, and assure us that they are for such a purpose, &c." The Papists build the Authority of the Canon upon the Authority of the Church, by which they mean *Ecclesiasticks*. Mr. H---gs builds the Authority of the Christian Religion upon the same Foundation, in other Words.

§. 82. In his fifth Section, where the Bishop is treated with so little Reverence, and the Evidence of the Christian Religion plac'd by Mr. H---gs upon so sandy a Foundation; he points some artless Reflections against some of the greatest Divines of our Church, who making the Scriptures their Rule, and genuine Antiquity their Guide, have with honest Courage imitated their Forefathers who liv'd before, at, and since the Reformation. If Persons were to be blam'd for altering their Judgments, to what purpose are all Scripture-Instructions and Exhortations? *Not to see gross Mistakes, is to be Stupid; not to own what we see, is to be Hypocrites; and to condemn the Apostles, and many of the Primitive Fathers, whose Glory it was that they alter'd their Judgments, and openly profess'd it, tho it cost 'em their Lives.* I wish this Gentleman wou'd so well consider Persons and Things, as to mend his Mistakes, and acknowledge 'em too. Wou'd any body that has a true regard for his own Character, be guilty of such Trifling as he plays upon his Readers



ders in his last Section? He thinks fit to put the Bishop in mind of some Passages in our *Articles, Canons, and History* relating to Ordination, &c. as if the Bishop had either forgot, or rejected 'em. Undoubtedly Mr. H—gs is as proper a Monitor, as *Harding* was to Bishop *Jewel*. 'Tis well for that Bishop that Mr. H—gs was not his Cotemporary, he wou'd have reprimanded him severely for several Passages in his admirable Apology; as particularly for these Words, p. 182. *Animo pio et Deum timentis promissa est Dei Gratia, non Cathedris et Successionibus.* Mr. H—gs wou'd have loaded him with Tragical Accusations of slighting and despising the Episcopal Powers and Sacred Character, of rejecting the great Evidence of the Christian Religion, and of holding Principles that seem destructive of all Reveal'd Religion. I think Mr. H—gs is one of the first who has made a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession* one of the prime Evidences of the Christian Religion. The Papists, indeed, have made it one of the Marks of the true Church; but whoever looks into the Writings of our most eminent Reform'd Divines, will find, that they have by no means laid any stress upon such a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession* of Persons in Holy Offices; but upon a *Succession in the true Faith, and sound Doctrine*, which was the very Sense of the Primitive Fathers. *Tertul.* in *Lib. de Prescription.* says, *Non ex personis fidem, sed ex fide personas probari oportet.* And St. *Ambrose*, de *Penitentia*, l. 1. c. 6. says, *Non habent Hereditatem Petri, qui fidem Petri non habent.* Mr. H—gs may see, that the Pope's Pretence of a *regular uninterrupted Succession* from St. *Peter*, would have been despis'd by St. *Ambrose*, unless he succeeded to the Faith of St. *Peter*, which we are sure he does not. Yet in this Point of Succession, the Vanity and Pride of our *Romish* Adversaries

series is very remarkable, and very ridiculous: And 'tis not less remarkable, that some amongst us snatch up Popish Cudgels, with which they assault their own Protestant Bishops. 'Tis a melancholy, but a true Observation, that some peevish Spirits amongst us, who are weak in the Faith, but strong in their Passions and Resentments, having taken Offence at the late Revolution, are grown angry with their Leaders, and are making daily Advances towards Popery. Several Proofs of this are to be met with in the Writings of Dr. *Niches*, and Mr. *Lestly*, and others too, whom I am unwilling to name, because I would hope they may grow wiser.

§. 83. But I must return to Mr. *H—gs*, who because he so boldly challenges the Bishop in his *Enquiry*, and his *Address to the Convocation*, upon the point of a regular uninterrupted Succession, &c. he's desir'd to look over any Series of Bishops, of any of the Sees now extant, and consider with himself, if he can trace any one Succession, from the present Bishop up to the Apostles, that has been strictly regular in all the intermediate Bishops; and if he can produce such certain and undoubted Accounts of such a Succession, as may fully satisfy himself and all other reasonable Men, that there has been no Irregularity in the whole Succession. My Lord, Mr. *H—gs* must be furnish'd with some extraordinary Accounts besides what are now publick, if he can make out this regular Succession with that Certainty, as his Opinion of the Necessity of such a Succession does necessarily require he should. He will find himself oblig'd to suppose and presume in many Particulars, where he cannot have Certainty, and will be forc'd to speak in as modest Terms about this regular Succession, as the Bishop and other wise Men have done; who taking things as they find them,

80 *The Bishop of BANGOR's*

them, lay no greater stress upon them than they will bear.

§. 84. My Lord, this Gentleman's Zeal would not let him rest after a single Attack upon the Bishop of *Bangor*; but he comes on with another Assault upon him, and two other Divines, in a Paper call'd, *The Layman's humble Address to the Convocation, &c.* The Title and Conclusion are in the Stile of one Person, but the beginning is Plural. What *Helps* he has had, I know not; but I doubt he has *no Friends* to advise him, or is deaf to all Advice. It must be some Satisfaction to the Bishop and his Friends to observe, that the *Preservative* has not yet been oppos'd by one judicious Writer. His Lordship's only Antagonists are the *open Enemies*, or the *ignorant Friends* of our Church and Constitution: Of the last there would be some Hopes, if they would please to review the *Preservative* with less Passion, and more Attention and Modesty: Rare Qualities, I confess, in an *Adversary*, but not impossible to be found in a *good Christian*. Had Mr. *H—gs* acted in this matter with a due regard to himself and his Superiours, for whom he often professes a great regard, the Publick had not seen his *Address to the Bishops*. My Lord, there are, as is well known, abundance of Lay-Gentlemen and others of our Communion, as much concern'd in these Matters, and as capable of representing their Concern to the *Convocation*, as Mr. *H—gs*. But since the Case of two of the Reverend Divines, against whom Mr. *H—gs* is become an *Appellant*, has been dismiss'd by that *venerable Body*; he should have shewn them so much Duty at least, as to forbear to sollicite them, and have left them to take their own, which we hope will be a seasonable time, for a further Deliberation upon those weighty and important Points; which are of that high Nature,



Nature, that they deserve the strictest and most attentive Consideration. Upon all the ordinary Heads of Controversy with the Church of *Rome*, *our* and the foreign Reformers had written with so much Judgment and Exactness at the beginning of the *Reformation*, that they left little room for Additions or Improvement. Most of the Texts were examin'd, and the several Passages in the *Fathers* were produc'd to the greatest advantage: But the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, and the *Divinity* of our *Blessed Saviour*, were receiv'd in *our Church* at the beginning of *our happy Reformation*, as those Doctrines were then generally understood and explain'd in all the *Western Churches*. These great *Mysteries* being attended with Difficulties both in the Manner of our Conception of them, and Expressions about them, *our Divines* of the highest Rank have, upon occasion, unhappily interfer'd; as Dr. *South*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Wallis*, and others, did at the end of the *last Century*, and some other great Men at the beginning of *this*. By which wise Men plainly see the great Necessity of Charity and Temper in such sublime Speculations, and do also humbly hope a happy time may come, when those great Points may be fully examin'd, and fairly stated in our *Supreme Ecclesiastical Council*; so as to silence all Disputes amongst our selves, and to set a Standard to all other *Christian Churches*. This would be a glorious Work, and be attended with blessed Consequences.

§. 85. May Your Lordship, whom God has honour'd with the highest Dignity in the *Christian Church*, and with a Zeal for our Church, and Love to your Country, futable to your sacred Character, be one of the happy Instruments of advancing the Honour and Peace of our Church; that she may be the Praise  
L of

82 *The Bishop of BANGOR's, &c.*  
*of all Nations, and the Glory of Christendom, under*  
*the most auspicious Reign of his Sacred Majesty*  
*King GEORGE. I am,*

My LORD,

With the greatest Duty and Veneration,

Your Lordship's most Obedient, and

Most Humble Servant.



**F I N I S.**

**E R R A T.**

In the Marginal Note at the bottom of p. 24. at the end of  
the first Line, for *deriv'd from their Offices, r. depriv'd.*

**BOOKS sold by JOHN DARBY in Bartholomew-Close.**

**T**HE Divine Rights of the *British* Nation and Constitution vindicated: In Remarks on the several Papers publish'd against the Reverend Mr. *Hoadley's* Considerations upon the Bishop of *Exeter's* Sermons. The Second Edition corrected.

Archbishop *Tillotson's* Sermon, on Doing as we would be done unto: not printed in any of his Works.

The Charge of God to *Josbua*: a Thanksgiving-Sermon preach'd before the D. of *Marlborough*, for passing the Lines, and taking *Bouchain*. By *Francis Hare*, D. D.

—— *Bouchain*: a Dialogue between the late *Medley* and *Examiner*.

—— The Management of the late War, in 4 Letters to a Tory Member.

—— The Allies and the Late Ministry defended, in answer to *The Conduct of the Allies*. In 4 parts.

—— Frauds at *St. Paul's*. In 2 parts.

*K. William's* Affection to the Church of *England* consider'd.

Inquiry into the Genuine Authority of *1 John* 5. 7. *There be three that bear Record in Heaven, &c.*

A new Catechism, with Dr. *Hickes's* thirty nine Articles. With a Preface, relating to the true Interest of *Great Britain*, both in Church and State.

Some Thoughts on the Representation of the Lower House of Convocation. In a Letter to Dr. *Aterbury*.

A Letter to a *North-Wiltshire* Clergyman, relating to an Address from that Archdeaconry to the Queen. With a Character of the Bishop of *Sarum*, and an Account of the Clergy's Behaviour towards him.



BOOKS BY J. L. D. in Bar-  
tholomew-Clot.

THE H. Divine Rights of the British Nation and  
Constitution vindicated: In Remarks on the  
Several Papers published against the Reverend Mr.  
H. Considerations upon the Bishop of Exeter's  
Sermons. The second Edition corrected.

Archbishop Tillotson's Sermon, on Doing as we  
would be done unto: not printed in any of his  
Works.

The Charge of God to the People, a Thanksgiving  
Sermon preach'd before the Hon. the House of  
Commons, the Lines, and the Town of London.  
By Francis

St. D. D. a Dialogue between the late King  
and his Ministers.

The Management of the late War, in a  
Letter to a Tory Member.

The Allies and the late Ministry defended,  
in answer to the Conduct of the Allies, the parties.

Friends at St. Paul's, in a party.

K. William's Affection to the Church of England  
consider'd.

Inquiry into the Genuine Authority of the Jewish  
Law, as far as it bears upon the Christian Religion.

A new Catechism, with Mr. Tillotson's thirty nine  
Articles. With a Preface, relating to the true In-  
terest of Great Britain, both in Church and State.

Some Thoughts on the Representation of the  
Lower House of Convocation. In a Letter to Dr. M.

A Letter to a North-Whig's Clergyman, con-  
taining an Address from that Archbishop, to the  
Queen. With a Character of the Bishop of Exeter,  
and an Account of the Queen's Behaviour towards  
him.

